KAUTILYA'S POLITICAL THEORY

Yogakshema- the concept of Welfare State

RITU KOHLI

Foreword by Prof. M.M. Sankhdher

The Book

The common myth that the idea of welfare state originated in the West has been exploded in this book by the author who holds "that it is amazing to note that although we try to find the roots of such an ideology in the West yet its roots always lay in India." In fact, Kautilya over-reached the modern concept in that his *Yogakshema* aims at an all-round development, material as well as spiritual, of the society as well as of the individual. It involves the well-being of the poorest of the poor. The Kautilyan state, we are told, ensured freedom, happiness, prosperity and full-fledged development of human personality. *Yogakshema* demanded a higher moral consciousness both at the elites' and common peoples' levels.

We, habitually, tend to reject Sanskrit concepts because of their antiquity, regardless of the richness of their philosophical content. Kautilyan concept of the state, systematically formulated, and having the support of the wisdom of the ages, is one such. He sought to comprehend the totality of the human condition and produced a synthesis of what, in later years outside India, was projected as contradictory in terms of empirical and normative methodologies. His was a practical integrative political philosophy drawn from a profound metaphysical source. Many of the confusions and ambiguities in current political thinking in India and abroad can be removed in case the inbuilt biases against India, ancient and modern, can be removed. Happily and hopefully, we are opening up to the idea of revising the existing concepts in the light of the rich heritage bequeathed to us in the form of scriptural texts. Without being utopian or idealists, political theorists can draw sustainable inputs once they take a dip into the holistic Hindu cultural mainstream and debunk the motivated propaganda of being "revivalist," "obscurantist," "communal," and the like.

Ritu Kohli has pointed to this challenging task of rightly placing the Kautilyan perceptions in a frame of relevance. Among other things, she has delineated the social, economic, political and administrative aspects, just to suggest that the idea of welfare cannot be treated in isolation. But of greater significance, perhaps, is the distinction and distance that Kautilya maintained between society and state, individual and state and between welfare and happiness.

Rs. 200

ITY

A.P.T — S.P. Verma, Johri

C.P — Johri, P.D Sharma

Int. Law — S.K. Kapoor
" " — Phariyal

M B Room
Dharam Pal 4-4-33

KAUTILYA'S POLITICAL THEORY

YOGAKSHEMA — THE CONCEPT OF WELFARE STATE

KAUTILYA'S POLITICAL THEORY

YOGAKSHEMA — THE CONCEPT OF WELFARE STATE



RITU KOHLI
Department of Political Science,
Maharaja Agrasen College,
University of Delhi, Delhi

Foreword by

PROFESSOR M.M. SANKHDHER (Retd.)
Department of Political Science,
University of Delhi, Delhi



DEEP & DEEP PUBLICATIONS
F-159, Rajouri Garden, New Delhi - 110027

ISBN 81-7100-802-X

Laser Typeset by LASER DOT,
J-102, Sector 25, Noida-201301

Printed in India at Elegant Printers,
[illegible], Mayapuri, Phase I, New Delhi-110064

Published by DEEP & DEEP Publications,
F-159, Rajouri Garden,
New Delhi-110027. Phones : 5435369, 5440916

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

Way back, to be sure, in 1962, I had my first rendezvous with Professor Kenneth Minogue at the London School of Economics with regard to my Ph.D. proposal on India as a welfare state. I vividly remember his inquisition and raised eyebrows curiosity whether India could fall in the category of welfare states. As is usually the case, any state, including the most authoritarian or repressive, he implied, could claim to be a welfare state since every state, as the text books tell us, take up some optional functions of welfare in addition to their police responsibilities. It became clear to me that the term "welfare state" applies to a specific type having been identified in the famous Beveridge Report, 1944, and that the first welfare state in modern times was established in Great Britain on the lines of the Beveridge Report to provide social security, unemployment insurance, health care and several other kindred benefits to different sections of society. Surely, India, strictly speaking, cannot be characterised as a welfare state on this criteria.

Why I am tempted to refer to the above experience is because, firstly we trace the genesis of every political concept to the west. And, secondly because of the colonial attitude of British intellectuals towards India. While the Western historians completely ignore India's contribution to political theory, Indian political scientists too have not cared to learn from Western experiences. Hence, welfare state studies in India are even today in a state of infancy. This is an astounding admission that faculties of social

sciences in our country are frankly deficient in the knowledge of political theory in that they have, in their curricula, by passed this significant western development. Notwithstanding the fact that most of our political science is West-oriented, the welfare state experience is totally missing. Not only that, what is more depressing is the neglect of Sanskrit classics and philosophical wisdom of ancient India which provide us with enormous literature to formulate *de novo* Indian political theory, on the one hand, and a rich concept of the welfare state, on the other.

With this end in view, this work of Ritu Kohli—"Kautilya's Political Theory", with the sub-title, "*Yogakshema*—The Concept of the Welfare State" is a new beginning. While a lot of light has been shed by scholars on the historical significance of the *Arthasastra* as also on his contribution to statecraft and administration, the profuse classical scriptures have not so far been scanned from the political science angle. It is, therefore, satisfying to see an initial Indian version of the welfare state, in terms of both tradition and modernity.

The common myth that the idea of welfare state originated in the West has been exploded by the author who holds "that it is amazing to note that although we try to find the roots of such an ideology in the West yet its roots always lay in India". In fact, Kautilya over-reached the modern concept in that his *Yogakshema* aims at an all-round development, material as well as spiritual, of the society as well as of the individual. It involves the well-being of the poorest of the poor. The Kautilyan state, we are told, ensured freedom, happiness, prosperity and full-fledged development of human personality. *Yogakshema* demanded a higher moral consciousness both at the elites' and common peoples' levels.

We, habitually, tend to reject Sanskrit concepts because of their antiquity, regardless of the richness of their philosophical content. Kautilyan concept of the state, systematically formulated, and having the support of the wisdom of the ages, is one such. He sought to comprehend the totality of the human condition and produce a synthesis

of what, in later years outside India, was projected as contradictory in terms of empirical and normative methodologies. His was a practical integrative political philosophy drawn from a profound metaphysical source. Many of the confusions and ambiguities in current political thinking in India and abroad can be removed in case the inbuilt biases against India, ancient and modern, can be removed. Happily and hopefully, we are opening upto the idea of revising the existing concepts in the light of the rich heritage bequeathed to us in the form of scriptural texts. Without being utopian or idealists, political theorists can draw sustainable inputs once they take a dip into the holistic Hindu cultural mainstream and debunk the motivated propaganda of being "revivalist", "obscurantist", "communal", and the like.

Ritu Kohli has pointed to this challenging task of rightly placing the Kautilyan perceptions in a frame of relevance. Among other things, she has delineated the social, economic, political and administrative aspects, just to suggest that the idea of welfare cannot be treated in isolation. But of greater significance, perhaps, is the distinction and distance that Kautilya maintained between society and state, individual and state and between welfare and happiness.

She has cogently drawn conceptual differences between the modern welfare state and *Yogakshema*. However, there is need to probe further into the distinctive features of *Yogakshema*, such as, Dharma *versus* religion, selectivity *versus* universality, duties *versus* rights, self *versus* ego, self-employment *versus* state employment and, above all, the role of the family in welfare. In order to agree to what she considers as "superiority of the Kautilyan welfare system", there is also, in my view, need to weed out the irrelevant features of the ancient thinking processes.

Yogakshema, according to the author's conclusion, has all the ingredients of a modern welfare state. To my mind, there is a unique commonality between Western libertarians and the Hindu spiritualists insofar as they both envisage a policy of minimum state welfare, leaving

the individual to maximum of self-help. The basic idea, squeezed from the West and the East, is how to recreate a welfare state without state welfare, the state confined only to help the helpless. Towards this end, a new spiritual consciousness should inform the widespread material concerns in a manner that the essential liberty of man is secure in a system of obssessive democracy.

I am sure, Ritu Kohli's spade work will attract notice of students, researchers, public men, political elites and the common people alike.

New Delhi M.M. SANKHDHER

PREFACE

Kautilya touched almost all the aspects of human life, civilisation and culture within his concept of *Yogakshema* (Welfare State, in the modern sense). Unfortunately, Kautilya's ideas on welfare state did not receive the attention of foreign scholars and it is generally believed that the idea of welfare state is a modern one and it originated in the West. As a student of Ancient Indian Political Thought, I have been highly impressed by some ideas of Kautilya on welfare state, more especially his concept of *Yogakshema* and I am pained to observe that modern scholars have either ignored them deliberately or were ignorant about them.

There are serious misconceptions regarding Kautilya and his ideas. The aim of this book is to remove misconceptions about Kautilya, especially the view held by some scholars that he was a cruel, manipulative, tyrant and a believer in the policy of expediency.

The object of this book is to cover all the important dimensions of Kautilya's concept of *Yogakshema* relating to the welfare of the citizens.

To make the account complete, a few of political ideas of the early ancient Indian thinkers have been briefly

discussed. The text of *Arthashastra* was produced around 326 B.C. but, occasionally, references have been made to earlier and later texts. All efforts have been made to support the ideas and concepts of Kautilya by reliable documentary evidence.

Chapter 1 entitled "Conceptual Framework" dealt with the modern concept of the welfare state. Chapter 2, '*Yogakshema*' explains the ancient as well as Kautilyan concept of welfare state. Chapter 3, "Political Dimension" explains how the state or the king carried out welfare functions. Chapter 4, "Social Dimension" deals how society was actively engaged in its welfare. Chapter 5, "Economic Dimension" gives an account of how economic activity of the state was geared round the well-being of its subjects. Chapter 6, "Administrative Dimension" elucidates the question of the involvement of the administrative machinery in the welfare of the society. The last chapter of the book concludes with the "Relevance" which highlights how the ancient policy of Kautilyan *Yogakshema* can be useful or non-useful in bringing out the modern welfare state out of the crisis.

There is a close resemblance between the theories of modern thinkers like Woodrow Wilson, Fayol, Taylor, Gullick, Max Weber, Follet and Mayo are more or less inspired on Kautilya's thinking.

Kautilya's concept of *Yogakshema* can be viewed as a significant concept except for a number of themes in the *Arthashastra* which had local and historical application.

In writing this book, I have received help from a wide cross-section of friends and scholars. I acknowledge my gratefulness to:

Prof. M.M. Sankhdher, for his painstaking effort in providing me indispensable guidance and instructions in the preparation of this book and for writing the *Foreword*.

Prof. Mahendra Kumar, former Head of the Department of Political Science, University of Delhi, for helping me to work on such a challenging topic.

Principal Ruddar Datt, School of Correspondence Courses and Continuing Education, University of Delhi, for giving encouragement as well as valuable suggestions for improving my work.

Dr. Brahma Bharadvaja, Reader, Department of Political Science, School of Correspondence Courses and Continuing Education, University of Delhi, for providing me valuable materials and documents.

Mr. Devendra Swarup, Vice-Chairman of Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Research Institute, for making available to me useful literature connected with my study.

Mr. R.N. Chanda, without whose help it would not have been possible for me to complete this book. And lastly, the members of my family for their affection and encouragement.

Mr. G.S. Bhatia of Deep and Deep Publications for speedy and timely production.

New Delhi RITU KOHLI

1

THE CONCEPT OF STATE

Modern political thinkers claim to have devised the term 'welfare state'. Generally put, the term denotes those functions of the state which are in addition to its police functions. The state's intervention is directed towards bringing about an era of happiness and well-being in the society that it governs.

The concept of welfare state is associated with the use of the prerogative of the 'state' to meet the 'needs' of the members of the society. The term 'state' is sometimes used to refer to the territorial domain of a particular political region under its jurisdiction. However, the concept of the state, associated with welfare state pertains to the implementation of welfare or social policies by some instrumentality of certain authority to apply uniformly to all persons within the territorial domain of a Nation-State. The concept of state under such conditions has reference

to the exercise of authority-relationships under conditions where rulership resides in a centre of supreme authority for society as a whole. Since the exercise of rulership prerogative in societies depends upon making its Directive Principles, Fundamental Rights and state policies formulated with reference to rules binding in human relationships, rulership also implies a co-relative assignment of control over the use of instruments of force in societies. A welfare state conceptualised in this way would imply recourse to a centre of authority capable of using its authority to levy taxes, establish rules and conduct programmes to meet the diverse welfare needs of the society.

Articulated in the context of the 'Four Freedoms' the welfare features would place primary emphasis upon 'freedom from want' and 'freedom from fear'. The other two refer to 'freedom of speech and expression' and 'freedom of every person to worship God in his own way'. The residual choice presumably in the last two 'freedoms' would be left for individuals to make. The 'Four Freedoms' were articulated as reflecting the aspirations for a 'free world' in the context of World War II. Lord Beveridge, in that same period conceptualised the possibility of welfare measures to be undertaken by the State which would meet the needs of people from the cradle to the grave, ranging from 'health services' to 'full employment' and 'social security' in various forms.

Some critical reflections about the concept of a welfare state and what this implies for the contemporary world has to be examined in the light of experiments done in different countries. Enquiry into the place of ideas with reference to the establishment of order in human societies is worthy of critical attention to alternative ways of thinking and working with ideas that may be used to conceptualise and design ways and means of bringing about order in human societies.

The 20th century has been marked by revolutionary aspirations for an array of great experiments in the

establishment of order in human societies. One such revolutionary struggle was the Russian Revolution led by Lenin to realise the liberation of the oppressed. The other was the emergence of new Nation-States following the collapse of the major West European Empires, specially in Africa and Asia. Both the American and French Revolutions can be viewed as the generating forces for initiating these experiments. The first was associated with the constitution of the United States of America and the second with the French Republic. Still earlier epoch was associated with the British effort to establish a commonwealth through revolutionary struggles in the 17th century, and the constitution of the Dutch and Swiss Republics in their struggle for independence from the Spanish and Austrian empires. The Revolutionary struggle in Latin America during the 19th century was conceived in the traditions of the American and French experiments.

> "The prevalent definitions of the welfare state seem deficient on several counts : First, to emphasise its overt aspect of 'security' and ignore its vital principle of liberty on which it is founded; second, they view the welfare state out of the historical context in which it developed; third, they ignore the empirical thrust of the concept and tend to see it as a vindication of one ideology or another; and last, they tend to universalize the concept."[1]

In the British concept, we find the emphasis on the doctrine of self-help with the encouragement of a serviceable and less coercive state. The English concept of a welfare state was rooted and nurtured in the liberal philosophy of self-help during the 19th century. The British believed more in the areas of freedom that the state allows its citizens than in material benefits. The British approach emphasised upon freedom from want implying freedom for every citizen to seek welfare in accordance

with his own notions and needs. The welfare state assumes no conflict between the individual good and the common good but conceives common good as contribution to the growth of individual personality. But in no case so far the state has achieved the level of a true welfare state in the sense of not suppressing the individual's freedom of expression and of choice. Development of personality was the end of which the state was a means and, as to the concept of development, the individual and the society, in co-operation, were the best judges. In the British concept of welfare state, therefore, the liberation theme was the most pronounced.

The concept of welfare state denotes the assumption of responsibility by the state for the promotion of all-round well-being of its citizen. The welfarists believe that the satisfaction of socio-economic needs of man is the prime objective of all human activities. They, therefore, define the ends and functions of the state in accordance with this belief.

In a layman's language, every state is or ought to be a welfare state. The term encompasses the many ways by which the State, through a host of different services (various needs of life), tries to raise the standard of living of its people and help them to meet the various problems through which most of us have to pass at one time or another in our lives.

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* describes a 'welfare state' as a state in which the government plays a key role in the protection and promotion of the economic and social welfare of its citizens. The whole gamut of activities of a modern welfare state are geared to the advancement of the interests of the citizens.[2]

According to Morris Janowitz, 'the Welfare State' refers to government practices of allocating atleast 8 to 10 per cent of the gross national product to welfare. The definition of welfare includes all public expenditure for health, education, income maintenance, deferred income

and funds for community development, including housing allocations'.[3]

Abraham defines it as "a community where state power is deliberately used to modify the normal play of economic forces so as to obtain a more equal distribution of income for every citizen, a basic minimum irrespective of the market value of his work and his property".[4]

T. W. Kent attempts a more inclusive definition when he says that a welfare state is "a state that provides for its citizens a wide range of social services."[5]

Hobman describes the welfare state as a compromise between communism on the one hand and unbridled individualism on the other. According to him the welfare state guarantees a minimum standard of subsistence without removing incentives to private enterprise, and it brings about a limited redistribution of income by means of graduated high taxation.[6]

The definition of the welfare state includes political control by a parliamentary democracy with an effective legislative opposition.[7]

The process of social regulation by means of legislation and greater economic production gave a new dimension to the concept of state. The welfare state was a consequence of a number of factors which were equally important, such as, impelling force of a humanitarian conscience, the economy incapable of bearing the burden of demands, the rising competition, the rise in common man's expectation and the popular anger over tardiness as a method for delivering the goods. The welfare state as institutionalised responsibility had emerged in response to the peoples' needs of their struggle for social amelioration.

The socio-economic problems created by the Industrial Revolution and the two World Wars demonstrated the loopholes of a *laissez-faire* state based on the principle of open competition and non-interference by the state. Modern political and social thinkers felt that the state has to play a positive role in economic and social life of its

citizens. The state must have the power and justification to interfere in the running of private enterprises, to control markets, to directly run industries, trade and commerce in the interest of the welfare of the citizens so as to achieve the aim of increasing the national dividend which does not get limited to only the increase in the total supply of goods and services but also in the moral and social well-being of the citizens.

The origin and growth of the concept of the welfare state was the result of the interaction of ideas, mainly Conservatism, Liberalism and Individualism. Two sociological factors largely contributed to the growth of the concept: "one, increasing prosperity that produced a revolution of rising expectations, and two, the hope and the fear generated by the newly acquired manhood franchise."[8]

In this context, state-help and self-help became the two important focal points of welfare.

The idea of welfare state was born out of efforts to curb the crudities of unbridled capitalism on the one hand and to check the growing challenge of socialism on the other. The concept has its roots in the philosophy of liberal democracy on the one hand and that of total social control on the other. While incorporating the elements of both these philosophies, it also distances itself from them. It is opposed to the philosophy of *laissez-faire* insofar as it does not favour leaving the economy entirely into the hands of free market forces. Likewise, it also distances itself from socialism insofar as it does not favour exclusive state control of economic and social organisation. The welfare state is a compromise between these two extreme philosophies. The welfarist advocates intervention by the government to a reasonable extent in the sphere of economic and social activity to ensure that the ends of equity and justice are met. The welfare state allows the state to play a key role in socio-economic matters through effective and extensive regulations. The jurisdiction of state

is not limited to maintain the Constitution, law and order or protection of life and property of the citizens, it extends to all such activities which help in promoting the well-being and happiness of its citizens. Therefore, socio-economic justice becomes the end of welfare state.

Both capitalism and socialism have failed to mitigate the sufferings of the people because of their limitations. The unregulated capitalism has led to exploitation while socialism by its unbridled State control over human beings has led to regimentation and stifled individual initiative. The welfare state seeks to correct the ills of these two diametrically opposite socio-economic systems.

The welfare state intends to provide the essential conditions for good living. For this, it concedes to the State the right of intervention in all such activities as might contribute in bringing about well-being of the citizens. Welfare state provides for government legislation for social and economic security, government participation in business and commerce in a way that the common man is benefited. It also concerns itself with securing equitable income, undertaking welfare programmes for helping the handicapped and the deprived citizens, removing poverty and unemployment, providing social insurance, harmonising interests of the employers and the employees.

The welfarist considers extension of state activity desirable only to the extent that it subserves the general and basic needs of the citizens. The concept of welfare state pleads for a positive role of the State in the sphere of socio-economic activities such as State control over communications, transport, education, recreation, libraries, museums, social services, etc. The main exponents of the idea of the welfare state are : R.L. Mark, T.W. Kent, Herbert Marx, D.L. Hobman, Barbara Wooton, R.M. Titmuss, David Roberts and, Maurice Bruce.

Prof. A.C. Pigou in *The Economics of Welfare* and J.M. Keynes in *Full Employment in a Free Society* suggested a series of measures which a state committed to the welfare

and happiness of its citizens should undertake. A few of these are: "The state (i) to run a few important industries, (ii) to co-ordinate private investment and industries with a view to fit in the general plan of economic development, (iii) to control production, markets, prices and sale with a view to safeguard the interest of the common people against the unscrupulous industrialists, traders, and profiteers, (iv) to regulate relations between the employers and the employees with a view to avoid strikes and lockouts resulting in reduced production and loss of national income, (v) to control foreign trade in the interest of the security of the State and the good of the people, and (vi) to organise social insurance for the needy and to provide adequate medical facilities to the citizens."[9] In the opinion of Beveridge, these recommended measures will assure full employment in a free society without its becoming entirely a collectivist or socialist state. Such a state will certainly be regarded a 'welfare state' inspired by the ideal of promoting the welfare and happiness of the citizens. The interests of the people were to be the interests of the sovereign authority. This is the essence of a modern welfare state.

The idea of welfare state, though of recent origin, was not unknown in ancient India. The ancient Indian thinkers on political affairs were predominantly guided by practical concerns of good governance. In matters of social and political organisations, they realised the futility and non-desirability of a gap between the ideal and the actual, the theory and the practice, what is and what ought to be. The ideal has to be realisable as actual and this can be possible only if the ideal is formulated on the basis of concrete experiences. In ancient Indian political thought, theory is interwoven with practice in a dialectical relationship. They employ the empirical method consisting of observation, analysis and deduction.

Even in the absence of a systematically formulated advocacy of welfare theory, the political reflections are replete with welfare ideas much more rich and noble, much

more profound and universal than the modern ones that become the guiding principles of state policies and political administration. The elements of welfarism are so very widespread, permeating and pronounced that one might be tempted to construe a theory of welfare state as the underlying systems which every ruler was enjoined to adhere to.

But, the western thinkers and ideologists believe that the very concept of welfare state originated in the West. This I do not hold to be true. I believe, Indian thinkers also conceptualised this idea to a great extent. A close study of ancient Indian texts (Kautilya's *Arthashastra*, *Bhagvad Gita*, '*Shanti Parva*' in *Mahabharata*) is required to understand the very concept of the welfare state. These Indian texts are so comprehensive in devising such a view of welfare state that it is amazing to note that although we try to find the roots of such an ideology in the West yet its roots always lay in India.

To support my argument and belief I have tried to bring forth the ideology of welfare state by making a close study of the Kautilyan *Arthashastra*. The ideology seems embedded in his idea of 'good governance'. The study of *Arthashastra* enfolds the personality of Kautilya as a great thinker, politician, administrator, statesman and above all a compassionate human being.

Notes and References

1. Sankhdher, M.M., (1985), *The Welfare State*, Deep & Deep Publications, Delhi, p. 255.
2. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, (1971), Welfare State, William Benton, Vol. 23, p. 569.
3. Janowitz, Morris, (1976), *Social Control of the Welfare State*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, p. 2.
4. Asirvatham, Eddy, (1988), *Political Theory*, S. Chand & Co. Delhi, p. 161.

5. Williams, Gertrude, (1967), *The Coming of the Welfare State*, Jarrold & Sons, Norwich, p. 81.
6. Cf. Asirvatham, Eddy (1988), *Op. Cit*, p. 162.
7. Cf. Duverger, Mourice, (1959), *Political Parties : Their Organisation and Activity in the Modern State*, J. Wiley, New York, Dahl, Robert, (1956), *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
8. Sankhdher, M.M., (1985), *Op. Cit.*, p. 17.
9. Sinha, B.P., (1975), *Readings in Kautilya's Arthashastra*, Agam Prakashan, Delhi, p. 1.

2

YOGAKSHEMA

Indian thought, by and large, whatever be the domain of its reflection, has emanated from and is permeated by the basic idea that the whole cosmos is a divine manifestation with mystifying goals and justification not known to intellect. Beginning with the *Vedas*, passing through the *Upanishads* and the *Epics*, this idea has percolated down to the modern times in thinkers like Adi Shankaracharya, Buddha and Gandhi. All human endeavour and organisations, as also the course of the cosmic process, have their quintessence in perfection, freedom and self-realisation in *Aham Brahmasmi* (I am the *Brahma*), a state of supreme well-being and bliss named as *Moksha*. This attainment of a state of perfection evolves from material and physical well-being.

The point here is that at the mundane level, the entire social organisation and state activities were aimed at

general welfare and well-being and all efforts were geared towards social and general good. Human welfare was the initial step for movement towards spiritual upliftment. The ideal of all thought and conduct was:

"Sarve bhavantu sukhinah
Sarve santu niramayah
Sarve bhadrani pashyantu
Ma kascit dukha bhagbhavet."[1]
This implies:
Let all be happy
Let all remain without disease
Let all see all the good
Do not let anyone be worthy of Trauma.

This reflects that the entire social organisation and state activities were aimed at general welfare and well-being and all efforts were geared towards social and general good.

In the ancient scheme of thought, human welfare was to be ensured through an organised form, be it the society or the state. All our scriptures assigned the highest place to society where the king is the prime mover. The great ancient political thinker *Shukra* maintained that a king was both the master and a servant of the people. Therefore, the king had to protect the people as a master by virtue of law and as a servant by virtue of share of the gross produce received by him.

Kautilya affirms the role of the king as under:

"Prajasukhe sukham rajnah
Prajanam ca hite hitam
Natmapriyam hitam rajnah
Prajanam tu priyam hitam."[2]

This implies that the Prince should seek his happiness in the happiness of his subjects and his welfare

in theirs. His good is not what pleases himself but what pleases his subjects.

According to Kautilya, although the king is the protector of the realm, the concept of protection indeed is most comprehensive. It implies that he is the preserver, propagator and upholder of *Dharma* (*Dharmapravartaka*). Healthy economy is the responsibility of the ruler, therefore, ideal ruler and ideal economy go together. Any deviation in the ruler's behaviour from the rules of *Dharmshastra*, causes the destabilization of the economic order. Just as at one time, economic thought justified *laissez-faire*, that is complete departure of economy from the regulatory functions and responsibilities of the state, the ancient Indian thought was opposed to it.

> "*Anviksakitrayivartanam yogakshemasadhano dandah.*
> *Tasyanitirdanda nitih.*
> *Alabdhalabhartha; labdhapariraksini; raksitavivardhani; vrddhasya tirthesu pratipadini ca.*"[3]

This implies that unless the state exercises the power to penalise economic offences, the economic system would lose its utility. Thus, the codification of rules for economic behaviour and punishment for breaches of the rules are contained in *Dandaniti*.

Kautilya also maintains that *Danda* (Force) is needed to promote proper and equitable distribution of social gains, for material prosperity and spiritual enhancement. The state, at best, has a regulatory and not a controlling function.

Kautilya contemplates a state in which state activities were not to be confined to the maintenance of the constitution only, but extended to the maintenance, protection, preservation and promotion of a social order, i.e., *Varnashramadharma*.

Kautilyan concept of the state was so comprehensive in scope that it regulated even the minutest details like fixing the rates of washermen and even prostitutes. Kautilyan state subordinated moral principles to the necessities of its own existence and welfare and the same attitude was assumed towards religion which was made to be used even as a means for accomplishing political ends. Kautilya, when he talks of a crisis state, gives to the state a *Carte Blanche* but in normal times he was strongly in favour of righteousness and religious principles as a way of life. Viewed closely, the Kautilyan state was a welfare state, which aimed at the optimum use of all possible resources for the benefit of the state and its citizens. Therefore, according to Kautilya, *Artha* (Wealth) was the supreme constituent of *Danda* (Force) because his state aimed at a prosperous economy and augmentation of national wealth.[4]

The State was directly engaged in the *Yogakshema* (promotion of happiness and welfare) of the citizens, and, both the citizens and the State were revolving round the same common ideal of maximisation of welfare. According to Kautilya, the main functions of the state were as follows;

(i) Upholding the social order, i.e., *Varnashramadharma* through observance of *Dharma* (Duty).

(ii) *Yogakshema* (welfare of the citizen) — welfare implies well-being, prosperity and happiness.

(iii) Maintaining common law for all citizens as embodied in the ancient customs and usages of the land.

(iv) Protecting the society, i.e., preserving internal order and peace, protecting from external aggression.

(v) Maintenance of public works, consular and diplomatic services with the help of multifarious departments of the state.

(vi) Saving society from natural as well as super-natural calamities.

The Kautilyan state was in essence a welfare state not only in its ideal but also in its programme of action. Kautilyan state intervened, regulated and participated in socio-economic activities and, at the same time, it controlled private enterprises in many ways — checked unhealthy profit motive, standardised weights and measures and fixed prices. Private enterprises were strictly regulated for profit, general welfare and prevention of fraud.

Kautilya favoured regulation of private industries by the government for harmonizing the relationship between the employer and the employees. The state owned natural resources, fishing, ferrying, mining and trading. Textile, agriculture and commerce were also regulated. Irrigation was the main concern of the state. Useful animals were under state protection. As for imports, the guiding principle was the good of the society.

In Kautilyan scheme of things, private enterprise was more spread out than state works. There was no rigid classification between public or private enterprises. The economy was to be based on justice geared to peoples' needs, without the labels of private or public enterprises. There was a strong belief in favour of centralised supervision of all activities by allowing maximisation of production.

In Kautilyan *Yogakshema*, the individual's responsibility primarily was determined by custom but in case individual neglected his family, he was punished by the state. Kautilya reinforced the traditional rules even for the proper relationship between husband and wife, father and son, brother and sister and other relations. Even the conditions of divorce, separation and subsequent marriage attracted the attention of Kautilyan state and necessary provisions for their safeguard were made. The state played an effective part over a man's social, economic, cultural, moral and even spiritual life and that led to the development

of life as an integrated whole. The state took upon itself the responsibility of maintaining the weak, the handicapped, the orphans, the aged, the afflicted, the helpless and the deprived sections of the society. A fit person was fined, if he neglected his family responsibility. The scheme of social security was also provided in *Arthashastra*. To help the helpless was state's concern but the able-bodied were to fend for themselves.

Due care was taken by the Kautilyan state to maintain the sanitary conditions of the rural and urban areas. Villages and cities were to be built according to a plan. Special roads and river-ways were maintained by the state in order to have smooth functioning of trade. Safety of transit of goods and passengers was the responsibility of the state. Most people were healthy and did not need physicians, some did need private *Vaidyas*, it was the duty of the state physician to take care of the poor sick persons and provide necessary medical assistance.

During famines and epidemics, the grains, seeds and fertilizers were distributed free by the state to the needy people and, at the same time, the rich were heavily taxed. Food, shelter and shifting the people to safer areas by boats were provided by the state in the flood-stricken areas. To fight the menace of fire, adequate measures were taken by the state. People in distress were state's responsibility.

Labour was regulated in order to improve the condition of workers. The wages of the labourers were settled by contract before the work started. Non-payment or reduced payment of wage was punishable. There were special regulations for female labourers and at places where they worked, strict moral laws and etiquettes were observed. The state was the largest employer of unskilled labourers whereas the skilled craftsmen were self-employed. The area of self-employment among middle and higher classes was very wide. Private property of even slaves was recognised.

Kautilyan state was not merely concerned with the material and physical welfare of the citizens, it was concerned with the moral welfare of the people as well.

Kautilyan state sought the co-operation of the people at every stage, even though it itself felt concerned about each and every aspect of the people's life. Therefore, voluntary and co-operative efforts were encouraged and assisted by the state.

Kautilya was of the view that observance of proper balance between privileges and duties alone could lead to social harmony. Kautilya did not advocate the paternalistic view of state where the harmonious relationship between the king and the citizens is a precondition, without dependence of the people on the state in their normal lives, though some misleading phrases like the king as the father of the people would suggest paternalism.

The Indian concept of paternalism (state) is very much different from the Western paternalistic view of the state as propounded by Hegel who believed that it is the sole responsibility of the state to remove the distress of the people and the state must give fatherly treatment to its citizens (even in normal times), whereas the ancient Indian thinkers like Kautilya were of the view that state must give fatherly treatment to its citizens only when they were in any type of crisis. He said that citizens in trouble should first try to solve their problems themselves and if they were not capable of solving them, then they must seek help from the state. Kautilya emphasised the view that the society had to play the role of the helper, not the state.

Moral, spiritual and material conditions of humankind came within the purview of *Yogakshema*. Kautilya emphasised the maintenance of duties assigned in *Varnashramadharma* for the realisation of public welfare.

"Allround public welfare was clearly regarded as the chief aim of the state i.e., the promotion of *Dharma* (by fostering a feeling of piety); *Artha* (by encouraging trade, industry and agriculture) and *Kama* (by ensuring peace and order and by offering encouragement to fine arts), the State held its responsibility towards education and ensured continuance of thought in the spheres of higher aims."[5]

However, all this was within the framework of an open society.

Kautilya contemplates a state that is comprehensive in scope and catholic in spirit. Most important functions of the state as conceived by Kautilya are the promotion of *Dharma, Artha, Kama* and *Moksha. Dharma* and kingship are closely related and it is the king's duty to maintain *Dharma* and to protect his subjects, give them security and justice. The aim of the state is to create such conditions and environment that enables the people in the society to live in peace and harmony by following its *Svadharma*, customs and needs.

The reflection of the above ideology can be seen in the British concept of welfare state where the emphasis is upon the freedom of the individual and the co-operation needed between the individual and the state to devise means of development.

If examined minutely, Kautilya's state was a welfare state, which aimed at a fully regulated life of citizens. The state was actively engaged in the promotion, happiness and welfare (*Yogakshema*) of the citizens. The state as well as citizens were actuated by the same common ideal of greater good of the society. He outlined the functions of the state as: (i) protection of the state from internal and external aggression, (ii) maintaining the common law, (iii) upholding the social order; and (iv) promotion of social welfare. Kautilyan state was not merely concerned with the material and physical welfare of the citizens but also with the moral welfare of the people.

Kautilyan ideology is founded on the principle of the social (*Yogakshema*) well-being (See Appendix-I). I do not find the mention of the term welfare state in Kautilyan *Arthashastra* or any other ancient texts but a thorough study of ancient texts reveals that the social edifice was built upon the idea of social well-being (*Yogakshema*). I have used the term welfare state, in my work, in the context of Kautilya's concept of *Yogakshema* only.

The aim of my research is to remove misconceptions about Kautilya as a cruel, manipulative, tyrant and a believer of police-expediency. M.M. Sankhdher observes:

> "Often a comparison is made between Machiavelli and Kautilya and, Kautilya is described as the Machiavelli of India. Between the range of subjects covered Machiavelli's *The Prince* and Kautilya's *Arthashastra*, one can no doubt trace general resemblance but the two flow from radically different sources and imbibe opposite spirit and ideology."

I am using Macaulay's expression of Machiavelli to support my argument. Macaulay says "...a single expression indicating that dissimilation and treachery had ever struck him as discreditable."[6] For Machiavelli, treachery was a way of life but for Kautilya upholding of *Dharma*, and good governance was the main aim of the state to achieve the ideal of social welfare.

I have made an attempt to explore the concept of welfare state with its various implications. In the modern concept of welfare state, reflection of Kautilya's idea of good governance can be seen. In this context, I have tried to analyse the various modern definitions relating to the welfare state. The intervention of the state to achieve the objective of development, justice to all, upliftment of the poor, providing social security etc. are the main features of Kautilyan philosophy of *Yogakshema*. A close scrutiny of modern ideology also reveals the same major characteristics of the welfare state.

Kautilya did not make any distinction between the king (*Swami*) or the state. Kautilya was very particular about the upbringing, education and qualities of the king. The king should work according to the prescribed time-table. The working of the king was based on the *Dharma*. Kautilya gave prime importance to the king as all the welfare activities of the state rotates around the king.

The rise of Maghada witnessed the emergence of a large territory to be governed. Prior to the question of governance, the problem of bringing about a definite social order and provision of a congenial environment where the citizens could realise the ultimate aim of their lives without much hindrance arose. The role of the *Brahmanas* in the political order was eminent. A need was felt to structure the society in a manner where individuals help the state in the development process. Kautilyan concept of social welfare also includes some aspects of collectivist approach. He laid great emphasis on the family but at the same time made rules and provided means for better environment that the individual citizen could rise above petty problems and think about the society and the state.

The economy in Kautilyan time was not highly developed. Economic activity largely pertained to agriculture, cattle rearing and mining. The development of trade-routes, regulating trade, managing distribution system, co-existence of public and private trade, standardisation of weights and measures, minting of coins, trade development — indigenous and foreign, throws light on the planned way Kautilya addressed to the economic problems in the state.

In order to have an orderly society and planned economy, Kautilya emphasised the role played by the administrative machinery. He made administrators responsible for having prosperous socio-economic conditions of the citizens. He made various rules and regulations for the proper functioning of the bureaucrats. He gave minutest details of the administrative organisation, financial organisation, judicial administration, problems of personnel and corruption in public services, etc. The failure of law and order, the aggression within the state, threat to internal security are the supposed manifestations of the failure of bureaucratic machinery according to Kautilya.

Kautilyan philosophy of *Yogakshema* in view of the above is quite relevant in today's context. I would like to

add that the knowledge imparted by various ancient philosophers through the texts available to us should not gather dust. An attempt should be made by modern thinkers in India and the world over to study these texts and make use of the abundant knowledge and resources available to us and apply the ideas that are relevant in today's society for the welfare of people.

Hence, a close study of the Kautilya's philosophy of *Yogakshema* as well as the modern concept of the welfare state leads us to conclude that the concept of modern welfare state is rooted in the pattern of Kautilyan *Yogakshema.*

It is thus clear that Kautilyan State partakes practically in full the nature of a welfare State of today and even goes beyond the modern concept of the welfare State by associating it with the idea of human happiness.

Notes and References

1. Bhatt, S.R., *Welfarism and Classical Indian Thought*, Mimeo, April 13, 1993, p. 4.
2. Rao, M.V.K., (1958), *Studies in Kautilya*, Oriental Publishers, Delhi, p. 115.
3. Bhatt, S.R., (1993), *Op. Cit.*, p. 7.
4. Cf. Choudhry, R.K., (1971), *Kautilya's Political Ideas and Institutions*, Chaukhamba Publications, Varanasi, p. 244.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 252. See also, M.M. Sankhdher, *Op. Cit.*
6. Roa, M.V.K., (1958), *Op. Cit.*, p. 107.

3

POLITICAL DIMENSION

Kautilya maintains that the king (*Swami*) is the pivot around which the other elements of the state revolve. The *Swami* is the head of the state. The welfare of the society is incumbent on the leadership and responsibilities of the king, for he is the protector of the helpless, provider of the homes to the homeless, the son of the sonless and the father of the fatherless. He assumes the top position in the hierarchy of the elements of the body of the state. According to the Indian scriptures (like the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*), the king is always possessed of the attributes of seven persons, i.e. father, mother, preceptor, friend, financier (*Kuber*) and preserver (*Yama*). He, therefore, like a parent nourishes the subjects, like a preceptor advises the people, like a friend enjoys the confidence of all. He, like *Kuber*, provides wealth and like *Yama*, punishes the wicked. "The duty of the ruler to protect his subjects is, however, often

expressed not in terms of *raksana* or *palana*, but in terms of ensuring their *yogaksema*. This implies something more than mere protection of person and property. As is well-known, *yoga* refers to the successful accomplishment of an object, while *ksema* refers to the peaceful, undisturbed enjoyment of that object. Security, that is, protection by the state, is essential for both. But ensuring the two means something more than merely providing security. In fact, *yogaksema* implies the idea of welfare, well-being, including the idea of prosperity, happiness and so on. That is why the text asserts, "In the happiness of the subjects lies the happiness of the king, and in what is beneficial to the subjects his own benefit".[1] Thus, the functions of the king are to protect person and property and punish the wicked. He is to undertake administration of justice and take adequate measures for realisation of revenue. Besides, he should be generous and charitable.

According to Kautilya, the king was to regard himself as an agent of the people and had to abide by law as laid down in the *Shastras* or embodied in the customs of the country which were both a political constitution as well as an ethical law. The prince should seek his happiness in the happiness of his subjects and his welfare in their welfare.

The king or *Swami* has been accorded the pride of place, as the prime mover of the ship of the state. As the king occupies the central position in the theory of *Arthashastra*, most of the activities of state are controlled by him. For Kautilya, the king is the main pillar of the state, and the master of the techniques of statecraft.

A man of average abilities and potentials could never bear the numerous challenging responsibilities of the office of the king. Thus, Kautilya provides a detailed list of the qualities the ruler should possess. The notable among these are high upbringing, possession of a virtuous character, receptive mind, disciplined intellect, enthusiasm, firmness of purpose, and training in all arts and sciences. The qualities that inspire confidence in others and make

the ruler easily approachable are nobility, piety and truthfulness. Among the qualities of intellect are mainly the ability to understand, think, learn and retain knowledge. Bravery and quickness of decision-making constitute some other qualities. A combination of these qualities make an excellent ruler.[2]

Kautilya was very particular about the education of the king because only a king with a disciplined mind and body can carry on the state administration for the welfare of the people on sound lines. To be able to have high ideals, the king must be taught self-discipline through appropriate education before he assumed the reins of the government. Another aim of the education of the king is to prevent the emergence of the tendency for despotism in his consciousness. Kautilya is aware that a check on oneself from within is more effective. Such a check could be ensured by sound education.

"The prince is to start with a knowledge of Arithmetic (*Samkhya*) and writing (*Lipi*) and then to study : (i) the three *Vedas*; (ii) Philosophy under teachers; (iii) the different departments of economic life (*Vartta*) under experienced administrators (*Adhyakshas*); and (iv) the Science of Polity under teachers well-versed in its principles and practices (*Vaktriprayoktribhyah*). The prince is to observe continence, practise *Brahmacharya* up to the age of 16 when he is to marry. The study of History including (i) *Purana*, (ii) *Itivritta* (past history) such as *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata*, (iii) *Akhyayika* (tales of gods and great men), (iv) *Udaharana* (anecdotes and biographies, or, according to one commentator, *Nyaya*, *Mimamsa*, and *Upanyasa-Sastra* or words of fiction), (v) *Dharmasastra*, Law-books like *Manu*, and (v) *Arthasastra*".[3]

According to Kautilya, ignorance and absence of discipline are the chief causes of all diseases of the body-politic. The king, therefore, should be well trained to control his senses. He should be instructed in *Anviksiki* (philosophy), *Vedic* lore — *Travi* (theology), in *Vartta*

(economics) and in *Dandaniti* (politics). Prince should be well informed about the sciences of *Arthashastra, Nitishastra* and *Dandaniti.*

As all education depends for its fulfilment on the control of the *Indriyas* (senses), it is of the utmost importance that the prince should practise self-control, and conquer lust, anger, greed, pride, haughtiness and vain glory. The day is divided into eight *Nalikas* (Periods) and the prince is enjoined to observe duties allocated to each *Nalika.* The king's time table may be thus worked out :

"1.30-3.00 a. m. Rise from sleep by the sound of music or trumpets (*Turya-Ghosha*); pondering over injunctions of religion (*Sastram*) and duties for the morrow.

3.00-4.30 a.m. Determination of policy and plans and despatch of his secret emissaries in accordance therewith.

4.30-6.00 a.m. Company of the sacrificial priest, the preceptor, and the domestic chaplain and receiving their benedictions (*Svastyayana*); interviewing the physician, kitchen officials and astrologers.

6.00-7.30 a.m. Attendance at the Hall of Audience (*Upasthana*) and receiving there the reports of his military and financial advisers.

7.30-9.00 a.m. Continued attendance at the Hall of Audience (*Upasthana*) where he is to attend to the affairs of the people, urban and rural, giving free access to them.

9.00-10.30 a.m. Bath, Meals, and study of religious texts.

10.30-12 noon. Receiving the surplus of gold cash left over from the previous day (*Hiranyapratigraham Gatadivasotthitadhanasvikaram*); attending to the heads of Departments and assigning duties to them (*Adhyakshan Kurvita Karyavisesheshu Niyunjita*).

12.00-1.30 p.m. Correspondence by letter with the Council of Ministers; settlement of plans of espionage with the informers.

1.30-3.00 p.m. Recreation and rest and pondering over his policy.

3.00-4.30 p.m. Review of his Army, Cavalry, Elephants and Arsenal.

4.30-6.00 p.m. Consultation with the Commander-in-Chief as to his military strength; Evening Prayers.

6.00-7.30 p.m. Interviews with secret emissaries.

7.30-9.00 p.m. Second bath and meal followed by religious meditation.

9.00-10.30 p.m. Retirement for rest to the sound of music.

10.30-1.30 a.m. Sleep.[4]

This completes the round of duties prescribed for the king.

Kautilya lays great emphasis on the intellectual and moral discipline of the King. According to Kautilya, kingship and *Dharma* are closely related and the king is the fountain of Justice — '*Dharmapravartaka*'. It is the king's responsibility to maintain *Dharma* and to protect his subjects with justice, for its observance will lead him to heaven. In the observance of justice by the king, the people are ensured equity and fair play — an attribute of welfare.

Kautilya is a confirmed believer in the moral order of the universe, in the supremacy of *Dharma* over *Artha* and in the state being created by divine ordination to preserve *Dharma*. To Kautilya, political life is not independent of moral life, because the latter always conditions the former. The state has a moral purpose to fulfil and that is the maintenance of the social order — the *Varnashramadharma* (class, stage system) which will attain happiness in this world as well as in the world beyond. This is the highest concept of welfare enshrined in the Indian tradition.

According to Kautilya, the king is the first citizen of the state; and he shares the enjoyment of the kingdom with his subjects. The king as the protector of the people may be punished for neglect of popular welfare.

Besides this, Kautilya talked about executive duties, legislative powers, judicial functions, financial functions,

military functions, enforcing *Svadharma*, promotion of trade and commerce, promotion of arts and education.

DUTIES OF THE KING

"In ancient India, Government never signified mere police work... The Hindu conceived of the Government's function as comprising in its entirety the whole of protective and disciplinary measures, in addition to active duties necessary for ensuring the subject a proper realisation of his material ideas in human existence."[5]

The king was expected to execute and fulfil his other responsibilities, besides his daily routine work:

(i) Yogakshema of the Society

Examined narrowly, Kautilyan state was a welfare state, which aimed at a fully regulated life of citizens. Wealth was a means to secure the happiness of the people. The king was actively engaged in the promotion of welfare (well-being, prosperity and happiness) of the citizens. Maintenance of widows, the orphans and the helpless came under this category.

(ii) Upholding the Social Order

Preservation of *Varnashramadharma* through the observance of *Dharma* (duty) was another important function of the king. There is an unmistakable acknowledgement of the principle of *Varnashramadharma* and the manifestation of a desire to apply it in politics. To Kautilya political life is not independent of moral life because the latter always conditioned the former. Life lived according to the fundamental tenets of *Varna-Ashrama-Dharma* was considered to be ideal for moral perfection.

(iii) Enforcement of Svadharma

The enforcing of *Svadharma* (doing one's own duty) "on the subject of the state by regulations in regard to the

practices, loss of castes and orders, according to the rules laid down in the *Vedic* literature."[6] It was the foremost duty of the king to see his subject pursuing their own duties without interfering with the others. The aim behind this policy was the general welfare of the subjects at large.

(iv) Maintenance of Public Works

Money was liberally spent on public works which tended to be the common good, such as, laying out roads, constructing reservoirs and embankments or agricultural purposes, founding hospitals, rest houses and store-houses on public roads and other prominent places.

(v) Protection of State and Society

The state originates from the human instinct for security. Thus, the protection of life and property from internal conflict as well as external aggression becomes the foremost duty of the state. Therefore, the formulation of both internal and foreign policies was of great importance.

(vi) Saving Society from Calamities

The king was to protect his society from the natural as well as supernatural calamities, like fire, floods, epidemics, famines, rats, wild animals, serpents, and demons, The king should take precautionary measures to avoid these calamities but in case such untoward things happened, then the remedial measures should be taken. According to Kautilya, "The king should ever protect the afflicted among his subjects as a father would his sons."[7] Health and sanitation, medical aid and poor relief, and other charitable acts and deeds came under this category.

(vii) Maintaining Common Law

The king has to abide by the laws as embodied in the ancient customs and usages of the land.

(viii) *Promotion of Trade and Commerce*

Much attention was given to the development of agriculture. Proper measures were taken by the king to prevent the livestock from cattle lifters, wild animals and diseases peculiar to them. In order to prevent disturbances from chief herdsmen, labourers, thieves and boundary guards, the security and safety of commercial and trade routes was guaranteed by the king. The king was to protect timber forest, elephant forest, dams and embankments. The promotion of arts and education was also the responsibility of the king.

(ix) *Proper Administration of the Justice*

King was known as *Dharmaparvartaka*. It was the duty of the king to protect his citizens with impartial justice as this would lead him to heaven. In meeting out justice, a king should make no distinction between his son and an enemy. The king looked upon all the four *Varnas* equally before law. Punishment was to be regulated according to the gravity of the offence.

(x) *Duty towards* **Sanyasis**

Yet another function of the king was to watch the conduct and movement of *Sanyasis* (ascetics) as a class because unrighteous proceedings by them could not be tolerated. As they were consequently honoured by the king and society, they could not abuse their privileges. Fines were usual form of punishment. This was essential for the preservation and promotion of morality.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE KING

The Kautilyan king was not an absolute free agent in theory and practice. The king was to rule according to *Dharma*. The king was to unite power with wisdom as well as law and moral sanctions. Restraints on the authority of the king were not only format but restrictions imposed by

obligations. Kautilya holds that *Danda* (Force) must be applied with justice if authority is to have the respect of the people because unjust exercise of power is bound to produce resistance and reaction, and may even lead to revolt.

The Coronation Oath also acted as a powerful check. According to *Aitareya Brahmana*, the oath should be repeated with faith. The king promises — 'I will never be arbitrary'. The king promised to act according to the established law and a monarch failing to keep his Coronation Oath, forfeited his claim to the throne.

The *Purohita* (Priest) and the *Brahmanas* (The divine class) wielded a strong authority and that was a great check. The king had to descend from the throne and make obeisance to the holy power of the *Brahmanas*, in the *Punarabhisheka* Ceremony. The power of the *Brahmanas* is never to be discounted.

The ministers and other officials, individually or collectively, exercised a powerful check over the activities of the king who was advised to surround himself with men of unimpeachable character. The king is expected to consult both formally and informally the ministers and should act according to their advice.

The *Sabha* (Village Assembly) and *Samiti* (Central Assembly) also acted as a strong check upon the royal authority. The control of judicial function by the village council removed a powerful engine of oppression from the control of the king. The king was bound by the local laws and the established customs as well. The laws of the communities, professions and guilds were to be respected by the king.

The fear of public opinion was a real restraining factor. Kautilya wants the king not to make himself inaccessible to his people causing thereby public dissatisfaction. The king should take note of public reaction to his administrative measures. The threat of people's

dissatisfaction was one of the deterrents against the tyranny of heavy taxation, according to Kautilya.

The influence of *Dharma*, the identity of interests and the highly refined character of the king are mainly responsible in restraining the Kautilyan prince from abusing absolute sovereignty with which he is supposed to be invested.

COMPARISON BETWEEN KAUTILYA AND MACHIAVELLI

A comparison is often made between '*Swami*' (the king) in the system of Kautilya with that of the 'Prince' in Machiavelli, because of a superficial resemblance that exists as regards the means that both the philosophers recommend to be adopted by the ruler in justification of the overriding supremacy of the state.

Both stood for legitimising the use of force and fraud in the interest of the state *vis-a-vis* the aspiration of the people. Both also champion the cause of a centralised and autocratic monarchy against all other forms of government and for that matter, Kautilya as an advisor to Chandragupta Maurya enjoys a reputation not less than that of Machiavelli's as an advisor to Medici.

The common basis of '*The Prince*' and the '*Arthashastra*' are the preservation, acquisition and expansion of the state, though conditions in 15th century Italy and ancient India (4th Century BC) were different historically, culturally as well as geographically. At this juncture, the similarities between their works, in-depth understanding of human nature and politics ends and the differences come to the fore. For example, Machiavelli stood for the use of force for the preservation of naked power of the king, but Kautilya stood for the *Udyama* (perseverance) for the establishment of righteousness on the earth. Kautilya, in contrast to Machiavelli, is not prepared to subordinate ethics to politics because of his firm faith in the integrated view of life deeply rooted in the long Indian tradition. His

schematic diversion into Machiavellian mode is a minor feature of his total conceptual framework. Thus, the tenor of his thought is fundamentally opposite to that of Machiavelli.

According to Kautilya, "The techniques and prescription of the *Arthashastra* are comprehended in the concept of *Rajdharma* which is supposed to lead to heaven. Machiavelli by contrast, does not advise the prince to take recourse to ecclesiastical ceremonies for the redemption of his soul'.[8]

Kautilya is described as the Machiavelli of India by G.B. Bottazi, Hillebrandt and others. But such a description is misleading as Kautilya preceded Machiavelli by almost nineteen hundred years and, therefore, it is Machiavelli who should be portrayed as the Kautilya of Italy, instead of latter being described in terms of the former. There are remarkable differences between the conceptual and philosophical frameworks of both Kautilya and Machiavelli. Between the range of subjects covered by Machiavelli's Prince and Kautilya's *Arthashastra* one can, no doubt, trace general resemblances but the two flow from radically different sources and imbibe opposite spirit and ideology. The typically Indian conception of a synthetic philosophy comprising all knowledge on diverse human affairs stands in contrast with the Italian analytical and materialistic approach to social and political problems.[9]

Kautilya regarded the state as a moral institution and attempted at a moralisation of individual ends through the benevolent agency of the state. Kautilya is closer to Plato and Aristotle in his conception of state and kingship.

"The comparison between Machiavelli and Kautilya is inappropriate, though both Kautilya and Machiavelli were the originators of systematic politics, and conceived it as a scheme to coordinate with other cardinal sciences. While Kautilya regards the private character of prince as imperative for virtuous administration, Machiavelli leaves the personal and private character of the prince almost entirely out of

sight, and treats him as the personification of the state, wherein the private individual is inevitably merged in the politician".[10]

Though political duty and personal honour cannot always coincide, and private virtue and political effectiveness are seldom compatible, Kautilya visualises with Aristotle the possibility of a disciplined social order as a condition precedent for a disciplined individual achievement; as *Brahmacharya* and conquest of the senses.

Macaulay says of Machiavelli, "We doubt whether it would be possible to find in all the many volumes of his composition, a single expression indicating that dissimilation and treachery had ever struck him as discreditable".[11] Whereas the *Swaraj* (self-government) depends upon *Atma-Samyama* (self-control), truthfulness of speech, absolute devotion to duty, inner rectitude, piety without superstition and tranquility and self-restraint is the quintessence of ancient Indian politics.

Thus, it is clear that Kautilya and Machiavelli are two planets with different gravitational pulls.

CONCLUSION

In the conclusion it may be mentioned that in Kautilyan state the kingship and the law did conceive of the king's authority as that of a father — probably less to emphasize the despotic aspect of the father's role than to symbolize his duty to sacrifice for the well-being of those dependent on his protection. The *Swami* could know happiness only as his subject prospered and realized themselves in the *Dharmik* order. King's character should provide an example for his people.

Of course, the king's chief duty was to protect his subjects. But this involved more than law enforcement. There had been a notable increase in the welfare functions of the king in Kautilyan state as compared to earlier ancient Indian states. The king was obligated to promote

education, religion, arts, charitable services, agricultural and commercial development. If the sacred tradition was upheld, the country would prosper. According to Kautilya, this idea had the effect of making the king accountable for the general prosperity of the people as well as their security. If the king used his authority for his own ends, it was considered as theft of the citizen's wealth and also as a great offence for not providing security to them.

In Kautilyan *Yogakshema*, the state was a civil polity rather than a military one. Social institutions contributed to the well-being of the subjects in this world as well as in the next. It was the duty of the king to rule in accordance with the sacred law and tradition and he was obligated to respect and encourage the various customs and rules of family, *Varna* and associations, if they were consistent with the *Dharmik* code and for the preservation of the same order. The stated goal of the *Arthashastra* is the protection and welfare of the citizens. Their happiness must come before that of the king — indeed their prosperity and goodwill would bring happiness to the king. Rangaswami Aiyangar viewed the promotion of the public welfare as the justification for the royal office.[12] The interests of the king were the same as those of his subjects. Kautilya demanded subordination of self-interest of individual members of the society, from the king to the humblest citizens.

Notes and References

1. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *The Kautilyan Arthasastra*, Part-III, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, p. 118.
2. Nagar, Vandana, (1991), Saptang Theory of the Structure of the State, School of Correspondence Courses and Continuing Education, p. 53.
3. Cf. Mookerji, Radha Kumud, (1943), *Chandragupta Maurya and His Times*, Rajkamal Publication, Bombay, pp. 54-55.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

5. Bandopadhyay, N.C., (1927), *Kautilya*, Vol. I, Calcutta, p. 107.
6. Dikshitar, V.R. Ramchandra, (1952), *The Mauryan Polity*, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, p. 115.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
8. Verma, V.P., (1959), *Hindu Political Thought and Its Metaphysical Foundations*, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, p. 295.
9. Sankhdher, M.M., (1973), *Reflections on Indian Politics*, Kumar Brothers, Delhi, p. 125.
10. Rao, M.V. Krishna, (1958), *Studies in Kautilya*, Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi, p. 106.
11. Macaulay, *Essays on Machiavelli*.
12. Aiyangar, K.V. Rangaswami, (1934), *Aspects of Ancient Indian Economic Thought*, Benares, p. 348.

4

SOCIAL DIMENSION

According to Kautilya, the state (king) is required to safeguard the social order based on *Varna* and *Ashrama* system. The reference of this order can be traced in the *Vedas*. Since this kind of social order is sacrosanct, it is the duty of the state not to disturb it but put maximum effort to preserve it. In fact, when it comes to a conflict, imaginary or real, between society and state, the former is paramount.

The specific duties of each of the four *Varnas*, the indispensable component of society are described in ancient Indian literature including Kautilya's *Arthashastra*. The *Brahmana* was to study and teach the *Vedas*, perform sacrifices and make others perform the same. The *Kshatriya* was to study the *Vedas*, protect the people and sacrifice his life for the nation. The *Vaishya* was to study the *Vedas*, promote agriculture, cattle breeding and trade. The *Shudra* was to serve the twice born.

Kautilya's *Arthashastra* recommends *Shudras* to perform other duties along with serving *Brahmanas* in particular and *Shudras* should attempt to elevate themselves by living with the *Brahmanas*. *Shudras* were to assist *Vaishyas* as agricultural labourers, herdsmen or as traders' servants. Practising art and crafts was exclusive to *Shudras*.

The *Brahmanas* held a pre-eminent position in the *Varna* system. The imparting of education, priest-craft and control of religious life was in the *Brahmanas* domain. Thus, they exerted powerful influence in social life. This system was never challenged before Kautilya.

Recruitment in the army was from all the four *Varnas*. Kautilya always favoured a *Kshatriya* army or a strong *Vaishya* or a *Shudra* army. He could not subscribe to the earlier view that Brahmana army was the best. The whole army did not consist of *Kshatriya Varna* only, if large forces were required, recruitment from *Shudra Varna* could be done. The *Smritis* do not visualise any such possibility.

There is a very significant fact that in *Arthashastra*, Kautilya looked upon the *Shudras* as an integral part of the Aryan community. He distinguished them from *Mlecchas* or non-Aryans or *Dasas*. The text forbids the sale or pledging of a minor belonging to any of the four *Varnas* stating that no *Arya* shall be made a *Dasa* (slave) but *Mlecchas* may sell or pledge their children. The induction of *Shudras* among Aryans was the first revolutionary attempt made by Kautilya to assimilate the masses in the Aryan fold. It is amazing to note that such an attempt could be made in that period which militated against the *Vedic* norms. It is pertinent to make an observation of Kautilya's liberal views in this context as non-conformity to Aryan beliefs and practices. According to *Dharmashastra* texts too, like Manu's, *Shudras* were functionally differentiated with other *Varnas* but were not treated as inferiors.

The social order was founded on the system of *Varnas* and *Ashramas*. The duty of the ruler was to ensure that his

subjects carried out the duties of these *Ashramas* as prescribed by the *Vedas* and *Shastras*. These duties were as under:

(i) *Brahmacharya* (Celibacy) — Upto 25 years — the *Brahmachari* (Celibate) had to study *Vedas*, worship fire, to live by begging and to stay with his teachers till he completed his student life.

(ii) *Grihastha* (Householder) — Upto 50 years — The duties of the householder involved providing for his family and carrying out all the acts and duties as enjoined upon a married person.

(iii) *Vanprastha* (Wanderer) — Upto 75 years — This *Ashrama* included the observance of continence, sleeping on earth, wearing deer skin and living on the forest produce, all aimed at gradual withdrawal from material life after fulfilling family responsibilities.

(iv) *Sanyasa* (Renunciation) — After 75 years — The *Sanyasi* (sage) had to abstain from all work, control his senses, maintain purity, both internal and external and renounce worldly attachment for attaining a spiritual status.

However, non-injury to all, truthfulness, graciousness, forgiveness, and being compassionate were some common principles to the whole society. Kautilya emphasised *Svadharma*. Kautilya mentions: "For the society whose bonds of Aryan conduct are well fixed, which is established on *Varna* and *Ashrama* and is thus guided by the triple *Vedas*, surely prospers and never perishes."[1]

Kautilya emphasised the moral and spiritual development of the people. He emphasised the importance of *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kama* and *Moksha*. *Dharma* implied not only performing the religious and moral duties but righteous, humble, kind, sympathetic conduct, accommodating and obliging others. Acquisition of material goods, wealth,

property and power and working towards promotion of trade, industry and agriculture is what comes under the purview of *Artha*. By *Kama*, he meant gratification of desire, pleasure, enjoyment, sensuality, encouragement and pursuit of aesthetics and fine arts. This theory of *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kama* was known as *Trivarga* and *Moksha* was the final and the highest aim of life, i.e., attaining the eternal truth. Thus, in the preservation of social order of *Varnashramdharma* by the State, citizens could realise their best welfare.

EDUCATION

Kautilya attached great importance to education. If the nation had to steer ahead, educating the masses was of great importance. The absence of education and discipline was the major cause for the various problems of a *Rashtra*. Kautilya made it obligatory for the three higher *Varnas* to acquire knowledge through education. The following were the four types of agencies for imparting education:

(i) *Gurukula* system
(ii) *Ashramas*
(iii) *Charakas* (wandering scholars)
(iv) *Vidvat Parishads*

According to Kautilya, the pre-requisites of education were: "*Vinaya* (discipline), *Susrusha* (desire for learning), *Sravana* (cultivation of the truth learnt), *Grahana* (grasping what is learnt), *Dharana* (retaining what is grasped), *Vijnana* (knowledge of ways and means of achieving the truth learnt), *Uha* (inference) and *Vichar-Vimarsha* (deliberation)".[2]

He emphasised the necessity of acquiring knowledge through all the four stages of life. The child was introduced to *Lipi* and *Sankhya* initially and later was sent to *Gurukula*. The primary education course consisted of

reading, writing and arithmetic. The secondary and higher courses comprised of *Vedas, Sankhya, Yoga, Lokayata*, agriculture, cattle-breeding, polity, military, arts and history. *Vyakarana* (Grammar) was necessary, because it was not enough if the educated people knew the language as a practical instrument for communication of ideas. It was also necessary that one should speak correct and elegant language. It was the obligation of every citizen to speak a language that was worthy of an educated person. In the case of the study of the law-texts (*Dharamshastra*), there was a great principle in civic life propounded, namely, that it was not enough if a citizen conducts himself in his civic life according to the law of the country; for a true and orderly civic life, the citizen must know what the law was and then conduct himself according to such law. This was the only safeguard for the permanence of orderly life in a country. Besides this, any law enacted by the king should be in accordance with the *Dharma* since *Dharma* was the basic constitution.

According to Kautilya, the real spirit of the *Vedas* was one of harmonious blending of the secular life with religion and philosophy. Students mostly depended on retentive capacity of their *Smriti* (Memory). *Smriti* was considered as a means for transmission of learning. Kautilya defined efficiency in learning — "From hearing (*Sruta*) ensues knowledge, from knowledge comes steady application (*Yoga*), from application self-possession (*Atmavatta*) is possible." [3] This shows that Kautilya believed in the *Vedic* system of imparting education. All were to be educated to prepare themselves to be worthy citizens of a civilised state. Literature, art, religion and philosophy were all integral parts of civic life.

Grant for education was one of the important constituents of state expenditure. The *Acharyas* (Teachers) and *Vidwans* (Scholars) received pensions. Teachers of music, preceptors and specialists in *Dharmashastras* and *Arthashastra* used to receive honorarium.

It is evident from the fact that the state took upon itself the responsibility of providing all expenditure on education. Kautilya wanted the people of the state to be well-educated so that they were able to lead the nation towards the path of progress.

Kautilya propounded the theory that the individual was an integral part of the *Janpada* and it was through the individual only that Kautilya wanted to achieve the social goals. Education helped the individual in building his character. The moral character of the individual as well as that of the king was emphasised by Kautilya time and again. Education enhanced these qualities.

According to Kautilya, the study of the bare text has no purpose. What was more important was to understand the meaning that could be utilised in the sacrifices. Education was universal and free. On the one hand, it was the duty of the society to impart education to all and on the other hand, it was the duty of the children also to seek education. In case of those who fail in this obligatory duty of education at the prescribed age, "one shall have no social intercourse with them."[4] Society would not have any dealings with such defaulters. This was to encourage and ensure education.

Kautilya wanted citizens not to be petty-minded so that the nation-building process could take place. Thus, we can say that the society was structured keeping in mind his ultimate goal of *Yogakshema*.

Giving pensions and paying honorarium to teachers was a step towards boosting their morale and ensuring the quality of education in the state. This provided respect for teachers and scholars. The primary purpose of education was to develop a very healthy civic life by speaking truth and observing *Dharma* as the basis.

THE STATUS OF WOMEN

The status of women needs special mention in any society. Since women played a major role in bearing children and their upbringing and also in their own development, they had a respectable status. Women were expected to maintain harmony in different relationships, that is, at the individual level, within the family, within the community and the state. It is important that women in the society were given due importance, full freedom and respected as individuals of equal intelligence. To achieve this, many aspects of social life had been reoriented. The society looked upon women not merely as child-bearing machines, but as co-workers in nation-building.

In Kautilyan society, as we gather from the text and interpretations, much thought and planning was done in the formation of social norms regarding marriage, divorce, family and community relationship.

The supreme importance given to *Grihastha Ashrama* for sustaining social life implied the responsibility of women in building up society. Marriage was one of the necessities of a man or a woman. The text says 'all transactions begin with marriage'. Kautilya mentions eight kinds of marriages—"*Brahma, Prajapatya, Arsha, Daiva, Gandharva, Asura, Rakshasa* and *Paisacha*".[5] Though *Shulka* (maintenance) in the form of bride-price figures in the definition of *Asura* form only, it appears quite clear that it is to be thought of in the case of other forms as well. Even in the case of *Dharma-Vivaha*, i.e., a sacramental marriage (one of the first four types— *Brahma, Prajapatya, Arsha and Daiva*), the payment of *Shulka* is referred to —

"*Dharma-vivaha hat kumari.... Ekdeshdatshulkam trini tirthani.... Akand ksheth, Dattshulkam panch....*".[6] *Manu Smriti* has elaborated on this type of marriage.

"*Vivahanam tu trayanam purveshanam, Varnanam panigrahnat sidhamupavartnam, Shudranam cha prakarmanah.*"[7] What is more significant is the fact that

there is a reference to marriage in the section on the revocation of sale or purchase and, it is stated that an agreement for marriage may be revoked before the ceremony of *Panigrahan* (clasping of the hand) in the case of the first three *Varnas* and before consummation in the case of *Shudras*.

The text dwells at length on the relationship between the husband and wife. Although the system of marriage was considered sacramental, a lot of importance was given to contractual obligations. Kautilya emphasised that the relation between a man and a woman should be of a reciprocal nature. He forbids the practice of cruelty towards each other. The limits of personal freedom hinged on the nature and extent of *Shulka* (maintenance). Kautilya permits re-marriage of women under special circumstances, women not provide for by *Shulka* had the right of remarriage with the permission of *Gnatis* (Kinsmen). Those whose husbands were abroad for a long time, or who suffered from terminable diseases or were sterile, could re-marry, if they desired. Kautilya permitted any form of marriage as legal, if it is accepted by the parties involved. Re-marriage was also permitted in the case of husband turning ascetic or being dead or leaving no issue. Even if there was an issue, prolonged absence also sanctioned re-marriage. *Anuloma* (Marriage by higher caste male with a lower caste female) and *Prtiloma* (Marriage by a lower caste male with a higher caste female) marriages were also allowed. A woman could marry whomsoever she liked, provided the husband could maintain her. "*Stridhana* (Dowry) was the material guarantee of the marriage in those days and it was lost to the bride-groom if he was sexually deficient and *vice versa*".[8] In respect of how long a bride should wait for her fiance, there are different variants mentioned in the *Dharmik* marriage. The one who fails to report the duration of absence ought to be waited for seven months. If nothing is heard from him, then for one year, if there are tidings from him, then for five months, and ten

months for the one who has fixed the date. In case a part of *Shulka* is paid, the bride ought to wait for her fiance for three months, if he is not heard of from any other source, and seven months if otherwise, when *Shulka* is fully paid the time is five to ten months. In this form of marriage, the woman enjoyed closer links with her former family and was comparatively an independent person. Although these provisions were made in the society, still great importance was attached to moral values. Adultery and rape were cognisable offences, in spite of the prevalent polygamy. The husband had to obtain not only the sanction but also pay a substantial amount to the first wife in case he wanted to get married the second time. Kautilyan *Arthashastra* was quite comprehensive on this issue.

It is remarkable to note that the Kautilyan *Arthashastra* deals with the question of harassment of wife by the husband and the possibility of her deserting the home. Kautilya allowed not only the separation between the husband and wife but also laid down laws as regards her maintenance. The *Arthashastra* considers the question of dissolution of marriage, if both the husband and wife loathe each other (*Parasparam Dvesah Mokshah*). Kautilya permits *Adhivedana* and divorce for women in case of long absence of the husband or when the partner suffered from terminable illness or infertility. In the case of *Dharma-Vivaha* the dissolution of marriage was not allowed but *Niyoga* was. When either party was against it, Kautilya did not allow divorce. The wife was also allowed to separate from her husband if he could not support her or was a murderer or accused of bribery or treachery to the king.

However, society had a more compassionate attitude towards widows. There is reference to *Chandavasini Vidhawa* (a widow living according to her will) in the Kautilyan text. The interpretation is that the widows could lead an independent life. They were allowed to re-marry with or without the consent of their in-laws under certain conditions. The choice of re-marriage or of leading a pious

life was of the woman's own. The text also mentions "*Brahmin* widows becoming *Parivrajikas* or wandering nuns".[9] The society was tolerant towards the choices they made to lead the rest of their lives after widowhood. "If she is desirous of a second marriage (*Kutumbakama*), she shall be given on the occasion of her re-marriage (*Nivesakale*) whatever either her father-in-law or her husband or both had given to her".[10] In this case the marriage had to be with the consent of the widow's father-in-law with one of her husband's relatives. If a widow had no issue and did not remarry, she retained all her property till the end of her life. At the time of her death the property was divided amongst her sons and daughters and in their absence it passed on to her husband. In case a widow decided to lead a pious life, she could retain all the property given to her by her late husband. Thus, it seems clear that the welfare of women was one of the important preoccupations of Kautilya.

Basically woman had limited property rights. *Shulka* given at the time of marriage, and other presents constituted her *Stridhana*. *Stridhana* was basically meant to be used by the woman of her own free will but could be used by the husband or other members of the family in case of emergency. A woman had right to maintenance for herself and her children. Besides this, there was no binding on a woman to pay her husband's debts.

It is observed that women were actively involved in business. Although the women of higher classes did not go out to work but they used their skills in various crafts at home and sold their products through agents. Women of lower classes worked in the factories and also worked with their husbands. So, the women of lower classes had more freedom because they could move in the company of the men.

Some historians and sociologists present the view that the Kautilyan era was not edifying for women. But a close study reveals that a lot of thinking has been done before making laws on marriage, divorce, inheritance, etc. Kautilya

was not only a statesman but his character had a humane aspect also. He was a liberal thinker who allowed widow re-marriage. Kautilya has dealt with the social issues in minute details. To keep the household *vis-a-vis* the society in perfect harmony, he laid down laws against cruelty towards women. Molestation, rape or any other outrageous conduct was treated as criminal offence. He even thought this a cruelty that a man leaves his wife and children without maintenance (i.e., he shirked his duty) to become a monk. A man could only become a *Sanyasi* if his sexual urge had been sublimated and even for that he had to take permission from the judges before actually leaving the householder's life. The system regulated even the urge for a person to take *Sanyas* for the reason that *Sanyas* may not be used as escapism from family and social obligations.

Kautilya could not perceive of a society where neither the husband nor the wife could come out of personal differences and think about the state. The Kautilyan text also mentions women living separately (not divorced) from their husbands. Thus, the concept of single woman was not unheard of. There is no mention of wife's immolation on husband's funeral pyre (*Sati Pratha*). There is not even a hint of bride-burning or such ghastly offences towards women which are a menace to the modern Indian society.

DHARMA AS A BASIC CONDITION OF HUMAN WELFARE

"By developing our inner spiritual nature, we gain a new kind of relatedness to the world and grow into the freedom, where the integrity of the self is not compromised. We then become aware of ourselves as active creative individuals, living, not by the discipline of external authority but by the inward rule of free devotion to truth".[11]

Religious systems have exercised a variety of techniques for establishing a relationship between the man and the supernatural. These techniques which were ritual actions were used by men to bring social equilibrium in the

society serving as intermediaries between man and God. According to these professionals, these rituals could reduce strains and frustrations as an outcome of uncertainties and inexplicable occurrences of life. Even modern sciences have acknowledged the usefulness of techniques of meditation as a means to forge relation with the supreme and reduce tension and stress.

"In analyzing the evolution of Indian religion from *Vedism* to the heterodox sects, it is important to point out that the deities of *Brahminism* are manifestations of an objective power, rather than the individuated personalities of the *Vedic* pantheon".[12] At all times, the order of the society is considered to be the reflection of the supernatural order, thus leaving little room for questioning the institutionalised values.

The primary function of *Dharma* was the preservation of the ancient culture in the face of hostile forces. Later when the integration of *Dasa* with the *Aryan* community became the major concern of the *Aryans* and the rigidities within the class structure had greatly reduced social mobility, salvation became more a personal problem, the ultimate consequence of the faithful, performance [illegible] duty. "The 'Religious' aspect of ritual now became more important: the manipulative element of magic remained, but supplication assumed increasing significance".[13]

Brahmnism as a ceremonial system included a particular type of social integration. *Brahmanas* were the first social group in the world to inculcate metaphysical qualities. The *Brahmana* minority controlled the means of salvation making religion a province of such intellectuals. By the 6th and the 7th century B.C. the Valley of Ganges was populated by *Aryan* and the non-*Aryan* tribes. *Shudras* were exploited, the *Dasas* were included in the *Aryan* social structure, usually as *Shudras*, the fourth and the lowest of the caste orders, although they were forbidden to participate in the sacrifice. The three higher castes, collectively known as *Aryas* had come to be considered

twice-born, which meant that their members were eligible for re-birth through ceremonial initiation. The *Aryans* had little intercourse with the portion of the population known as *Chandala*, who were held in contempt as they were considered out of the caste order altogether. This social system, based on complex occupational, status and religious differentiation influenced Indian life.

While exercising control over religion, the *Brahmana* priests were also able to direct education. The priests or *Rishis* were able to make their strategic position felt in the public affairs and the government as they were the ones who had acquired traditional and sacred knowledge. Indian history suggests that a society was so strongly unified by *Dharma* that governmental regulations played relatively a minor role. *Brahmana* was not subject to the temporal authority, but *Brahmana's* co-operation with the political class would aid the realisation of both the aims.

"A passage in the very early *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* which forms the conclusion to the *Shatapatha Brahmana*, states that in the beginning only the *Brahma* existed, but that he created in turn a superior form, the *Kshatra*: There is nothing higher than Kshatra.... (but) *Brahmanhood (Brahma)* is the source of *Kshatrahood*. Therefore, even if the king attains supremacy, he rests finally upon *Brahmanhood* as his own source. So whoever injures him (i.e., a *Brahman*) attacks his own source. We see in the *Shatapatha Barahmana* that *Mitravaruna* is called the 'counsel and the power'. *Mitra*, the sacerdotium (*Brahma*), is the counsel, and *Varuna*, the regnum (*Kshatra*), the power. And the priesthood is the conceiver, and the noble is the doer.... so are the two united".[14]

The *Brahmanas* were no corporate body as such as they lacked the strength of the hierarchically organised medieval Church but through the *Purohita*, the spiritual authority was able to exercise considerable political influence. They were expected to be materially poor, with no formal political power, but building a strong social

influence, because of their learning and selfless service. The Purohita shared the governing function with the king. According to the *Aitareya Brahmana*, the *'Purohita'* is half the self of the king. The sacrifice of the king was not accepted by the God if the king had no *Purohita*. A body of elders and *Brahmanas* served as judges under the council of *Purohita*. The office of the *Purohita* was equal in importance to that of the king himself and was thus a class apart from that of king's other ministers. According to *Gautama Dharmasutra*, the king must accept the responsibility for the moral laxity of the community and it was the *Brahmana's* privilege to define morality.

In the Indian mythology, the amoral dimension of *Kshtra* found its fullest expression in the figure of *Indra*, who represents the warrior virtues, power as well as authority. *Indra* has the right to go above the sacred code when necessary but purification and compensation are always required. This is one reason for the importance of sacrifice in traditional ideology.

CONCEPT OF WELFARE IN GITA

Lord *Krishna* told Arjuna:

"Ananyas cintayanto mam
ye janah paryupasate
esam nityabhiyauktanam
yogaksemam vahamy aham".[15]

This implies: But those who worship Me, meditating on Me alone, to them who ever persevere, I bring attainment of what they have not and security in what they have.

The *Bhagvad Gita* is considered as the first major attempt to bring together the heterodox doctrine and later *Vedic* concept of the transcendent eternal One. Motive and conscience take on new importance as the modern element threatens to replace the supernatural, and fear of magical

pollution gives way to a sense of individual responsibility. Society functions properly only when each group fulfils its obligations. Those who allow themselves to be controlled by lust and hatred become the victims of their own actions.

"Niyatasya tu samnyasah
karmano no papadyate
mohat tasya parityagas
tamasah parikirtitah" [16]

This implies: Verily the renunciation of any duty that ought to be done is not right. The abandonment of it through ignorance is declared to be of the nature of 'dullness.'

Action is called for even though it brings death and destruction and fatalistic withdrawal is rejected. Although fundamentally a fatalist, Kautilya, the designer of the bureaucratic state, warns against defeatism and what might be called the philosophy of determinism. In *Hindu* literature available to us, *Bhagvad Gita* is without doubt the best known work. Life in this world must be accepted, but man must try to improve the world where possible and he must understand that the concerns of this world are never more than a means to a higher end. *Dharma* is of prime significance, but *Artha* and *Kama* must not be ignored. This doctrine taught to Arjuna by Lord *Krishna* through the *Bhagvad Gita* can be seen as incorporated in Kautilya's *Arthashastra.* "Kautilya retained the *Kshtriya* ideal of action, but opposed the disinterested actions idealised in religious theories that consider desire and acquisition responsible for the evils of the world".[17]

Kautilya holds a pessimistic view of man's nature with the belief that man can shape his own destiny if he is able to develop heroic stature and place the common good above private interest. Preoccupied as he was for creating the basis of imperial power, Kautilya the *Brahmana* counsellor could have no sympathy for metaphysics such as Buddhism, which was interpreted as advocating non-action and

withdrawal as the condition for preserving the true freedom of man. "Kautilya understood that disinterested actions, such as that represented by *Krishnaite* ideal, could not bring strong organisation, and that to renounce action altogether was to renounce the real world. His systematic theory in effect brings together the idealization of action, the concept of self-discipline, the *Rajdharma* tradition, a strong statement of the *Artha* position ('on material gain depends the realisation of *Dharma* and desire') and the *Matsaya Nayaya* view of nature".[18]

Kautilya himself being a *Brahmana* must have disregarded his fellow *Brahmanas* as those who must implement ideas and proceed by a 'sense of the situation', reject those who remain in the pure world of images. Kautilya knew that if the *Brahmanas* were to survive they must relate their roles more realistically to the complexities of political life.

"It appears that in Kautilya's time there was religious ferment and different sects of wandering ascetics were propagating in favour of their respective faiths, and some had been organised, as he refers to *Pashandasamgha*, which may actually suggest the Buddhist monastic order. Kautilya was very much displeased with these people, and they were not to be fed on religious ceremonies and ascetics other than *Vanaprastha* were settled in the newly set up king's villages as they attracted young men and women to give up their domestic responsibilities and join the ascetic orders. Only the *Vanaprasthas* according to the orthodox *Hindu* scheme of life were allowed to settle."[19]

It is the system of social rules that was considered the reflection of order that governed the universe, the state was viewed primarily as an instrument of that transcendent principle of order and justice. Punishment is the very essence of the political function. The oligarchy tribal polity was a political structure in which the representative segment of the community participated in making decisions, and appreciable number were treated as the socially equal

to those in positions of power. Kautilya sought a centralised government by experts. Whatever the plans of their creators, organisations became ends in themselves, and possessed their own distinctive needs which have to be satisfied. In India it was rather a case of justifying material and secular ends as important in their own rights. The increasing differentiation of our cosmic and human realms may have indirectly encouraged illegitimate human pursuits. And when salvation had become more distinctively a private affair, the state was allowed freer scope for its various activities than was possible in the age of *Brahmana* supremacy. In the imperial state, there was no longer a place for the old ideal, apart from the purposes of the state. But this was no less important.

SLAVERY

From the pre-*Vedic* period, there existed lots of disparities among the various castes in the Indian society. Some of them are prevalent even today.

Slavery was the most prominent as well as accepted form of social disparity in Kautilya's time. The various categories of slaves mentioned in *Arthashastra* are —

"(i) Slaves made for subsistence
(ii) Self-sold slaves
(iii) Slaves captured in war
(iv) Slave acquired by purchase
(v) Born slaves
(vi) Slaves by way of punishment
(vii) Slaves obtained by inheritance
(viii) Slaves received as gift
(ix) Slaves given a pledge".[20]

Slavery is the most common misused term now-a-days. *Shudras* were never conceptualised as slaves. Domestic service was not viewed as slavery. Slavery is a

western concept imposed on ancient Indian society. Service is not slavery. Even the king had to serve the society. Slavery was applied to *Mleccha*. The term *Mleccha* covers partly forest tribes like *Sabaras* and the *Pulindas*. An alien or a captivated person not belonging to the native population was known as *Mlecchas*... The *Mlecchas* were employed to carry away the dead or to sweep ordure, urine or the left-overs of the food.

It is interesting to note that according to Kautilya members of any four *Varnas* could become dependents (temporarily dependent) depending upon their socio-economic conditions. For example, owing to debt bondage, by pledge relations, to work for a fine and falling into military captivity. But most of the *Mlecchas* were permanent dependents or slaves. It is clear from the above that the *Mlecchas* or the *Dasas* who were lower to the status of *Shudras* came under the true meaning of the term slaves and their owners treated them as their private property.

According to Kautilya, "The selling or mortgaging by kinsmen of the life of a *Sudra* who is not a born slave, and has not attained majority, but is an *Arya* in birth shall be punished with a fine of 12 *Panas*; of a *Vaisya* 24 *Panas*; of a *Kshatriya* 36 *Panas*; and of a *Brahman* 48 *Panas*. If persons other than kinsmen do the same, they shall be liable to the three amercements and capital punishment respectively: purchasers and abettors shall likewise be punished. It is no crime for *Mlecchas* to sell or mortgage the life of their own offspring."[21]

As we know, the Kautilyan thought revolves round the philosophy of *Yogakshema*. He made several laws for the welfare of the slaves. Kautilya imposed a ban on the sale and purchase of children as slaves, and any person, selling or pledging his own minor child, was heavily punished. This shows that he was very much concerned about child welfare. He was equally concerned with the *Yogakshema* of women slaves. If an employer asked a female slave to attend her master while he is bathing naked; hurting

or abusing her, or violating her chastity, the employer had to return as a penalty the value paid for her. Besides this, "When a child is begotten of a female slave by her master, both the child and its mother shall at once be recognised as free. If, for the sake of subsistence, the mother has to remain in her bondage, her brother, and sister shall be liberated".[22]

It is remarkable that according to Kautilya, the existence of slavery was an evil and hence could be reformed if tackled carefully. He granted the slaves the right to property. It was the moral duty of the state to protect the honour of those persons who were forced by circumstances to embrace slavery.

It was for the first time that Kautilya associated the *Shudras* with certain civil rights which were not contemplated before. He permitted liberty to lower classes as witnesses in the court. Hereditary slavery was abolished. This abolition was backed up by the withdrawal of the immunity of *Brahmanas* from criminal penalty and capital punishment. Unlike *Manu*, Kautilya prescribed that citizenship could be bestowed on any free man, irrespective of his class and birth.

Kautilya recognised mixed castes and the claims of the offspring of *Pratiloma* marriage for inheritance. There was no inflexible rigidity between the orders, the destruction of the old nobility was the most significant feature of the Kautilyan state. Kautilya makes a revolutionary statement when he declares: "The son of a slave irrespective of his father's status is an *Arya*, and that the offspring of a man who has sold himself off as a slave shall be an *Arya* and that he might regain his *Aryahood* by payment of the value of enslavement."[23]

SOCIAL INSURANCE

A scheme of social insurance has been provided in the Kautilyan philosophy of *Yogakshema*. The success of

any welfare scheme depends upon how the state dealt with the unfortunate and the weakest sections of the society. Kautilyan state took upon itself the responsibility to maintain the orphans, the aged, the infirm, the afflicted and the helpless. Kautilyan scheme of *Yogakshema* provides avenues of employment to the citizens. Helpless women, if willing to earn their livelihood, were to be given work according to their ability. The State even provided sustenance to helpless women as well as their children.

Kautilya emphasised joint family system as he felt that it was the best way of providing social security to the old and disabled members in the family. The *Yogakshema* philosophy emphasised the individual's responsibility towards dependents in the family and it was enforced by the state also. A capable person was fined, if he neglected his responsibilities towards his family. Any person embracing asceticism was punished, if he did not make proper arrangements for his family members for their sustenance.

Kautilyan scheme of social security was so comprehensive in nature that it not only emphasised the individual's duty towards his family but also it was the king's foremost duty to provide social security to his citizens.

According to Kautilya, it is the king who appoints ministers, priests, superintendents (of virtuous character) with their respective duties who, in turn, protect the people against calamites.

In Kautilya's view, internal security of the state was one of the sources of king's authority by which he could please his subjects. Kautilya, in order to provide internal security, described the measures that the king should adopt for winning over the friendly as well as the hostile factions within his kingdom. A specific class of spies played an important role in achieving his aim.

The king played an important role in the Kautilyan welfare scheme. He said, "In the happiness of his subjects, lies his happiness; in their well-being, his well-being; he

should regard as conducive to his well-being not what pleases himself, but what pleases his subjects."[24] In other words, the king was responsible for the security of the institutions of family and property. Kautilya urges upon two occasions the king's fatherly treatment of his subjects, "He says that the king should show fatherly kindness towards the cultivators after the period of temporary remission of taxes is over and secondly, the king should always treat the afflicted with fatherly kindness."[25] This shows that Kautilya was very much concerned about the feelings and emotions of citizens. However, this was not a system of paternalism as it developed in Europe. The Indian king was benevolent as a father, but was not authoritarian like a western despot.

Kautilya emphasised that social insurance depends on public peace also. Public peace depends on internal security as well as external security. He made the king responsible for both internal and external security. According to him, there were three different powers to win the enemy. They were — power of deliberation (*Mantrasakti*) which was to be superior to that of the army and the treasury (*Prabhusakti*) and the latter to be more important than energy (*Utsahasakti*).

He considered foreign policy as "the source of enjoyment (*Sama*) and effort (*Vyayama*) which in their turn are the sources of acquisition (*Yoga*) and security (*Kshema*)."[26]

Health and Sanitation

Any state interested in the welfare of its citizens cannot afford to neglect the health of the people on which depends their prosperity, security and the stability of the nation. Medical superintendents were appointed by the state to look after the health of the citizens and to control spread of diseases. In times of pestilences, medicines were distributed by the state. Doctors could be punished if the patient died because of their negligence or any loss of a

limb due to defective surgical operations. There were satisfactory sanitary arrangements and much attention was paid to the hygiene of city as well as of the countryside. Every house was to have a dunghill and an outlet for refuse water. Royal officials supervised the cleaning of roads and anybody found creating nuisance to public health was severely punished. Even the sale of cooked food was checked.

Housing and Environment

Kautilyan scheme of *Yogakshema* intended to have a well-planned city with regulated life. Planned city consists of different sections or areas for different communities, traders and *Varnas*. It was the duty of the city administrative officer to have full record of every household. The citizens had to report to them about all the arrivals and departures. It was only in emergencies that night businesses were allowed. All these measures came under the security provisions of the city. All these provisions were essential in order to have constant watch on enemy spies and secret agents.

"From each house a water course of sufficient slope at a distance of 3 *Padas* or 1½ *Aratins* from the neighbouring site shall be so constructed that water shall either flow from it in a continuous line or fall from it (into the drain)".[27]

Kautilyan planning consisted of minute details like public eating houses. "There is the (*Apupika*), the purveyor of bread, the (*Audanika*), who sells cooked rice, and the (*Pakvamamsika*) running a non-vegetarian eating house".[28]

The housing policy consisted of rules which were "mainly concerned with encroachments on the neighbour's property, causing nuisance to him, damaging his property and so on. In that connection a reference is made to the erection of a fence round the house, to arrangements for the disposal of the rubbish, waste water, etc., to arrangements for grinding and pounding, to cattle and carriage sheds, to channels for letting out rain water, to lanes between neighbouring houses and windows in

sidewalls and so on".[29] Kautilyan legal section on *Vastuka* (buildings and other property) have laid down rules for landlords and tenants.

Kautilya paid great attention to the issue of environment. He prescribed special routes for carrying away a dead body. The cremation grounds were out of the cities so that the atmosphere of the city did not get polluted by the burning of dead bodies. Throwing of carcasses of animals or man on roads was a grave offence.

Consumer Protection

Consumers were protected in Kautilyan scheme of *Yogakshema* against concerted hoarding or cornering of goods by merchants and against artisans conspiring to lower the quality of goods with a view to obtain large profits. In order to safeguard the consumer's interests, prices were fixed by the Kautilyan state. Even the marketing hours were fixed. "When a trader sells or mortgages inferior as superior commodities, articles of some other locality as articles of a particular locality, adulterated things and deceitful mixtures or when he dexterously substitutes other articles for those just sold, he shall be punished 54 *Panas* and be made to compensate the loss."[30]

The state gained considerable revenue from trade. But the interest of the consumers were uppermost. It can be proved from the fact that even the royal merchandise of local or imported products were to be sold to the consumer favourably. Big profit margins which would harm the people were to be discouraged. The traders had to use only standardised weights and measures which were duly stamped on payment of stamping fee, and any trader using unstamped weights and measures was fined.

Protection of Citizens

The Kautilyan state took measures to protect the common people against the anti-social practices of the professional classes. In the interest of production and for

the sake of the people concerned, any action by artisans or actors to cause loss of production and to demand higher remuneration injurious to the people was punishable. Indirectly these provisions highlight the state's deepest concern for production in the villages, even at the cost of depriving mirth, frolics and entertainments available in the cities.

Moral Welfare

The Kautilyan state was interested not only in thephysical and material welfare of the people but also in their moral welfare. The concentration of the manufacture of liquor, drugs and poisons in state manufactures were also designed to reduce chances of moral degeneration of the people. The regulations of gambling and prostitution, besides revenue yielding, also must have contributed to some restraint on moral laxity.

CONCLUSION

It may be mentioned in conclusion that although Kautilya believed in the *Varna* system but he looked upon the *Shudras* as a component of the *Aryan* community. This singularly distinguishes him from the earlier thinkers. The induction of *Shudras* among *Aryans* was the first revolutionary attempt made by Kautilya to assimilate the masses in the *Aryan* fold. This militated against the prevalent norms of that period and was thus intolerable according to *Dharmashastra* text.

Kautilya emphasised the moral and spiritual development of the people and this explains his importance given to *Dharma, Artha and Kama.* Attainment of material prosperity was also considered by him as essential as purity in religious and moral conduct. The philosophy of *Trivarga* encompassed *Dharma, Artha* and *Kama, Moksha* was the highest aim of life, i.e., the attainment of eternal truth. Obviously, Kautilya emphasised the effective role of

the state in shaping man's moral, economic, social and physical life.

For the progress of the society, Kautilya believed in imparting education to the people. He emphasized that it was the duty of the state to provide grants for education as an important constituent of state expenditure. The teachers and scholars were to receive funds from the state to impart education to the people. In this sense, he believed in an autonomous educational system which was to be funded by the state.

Kautilya's attitude towards relationship between the husband and wife was of a reciprocal nature. He forbids the practice of cruelty towards each other. In that sense, Kautilya believed in more freedom for women. He even sanctified marriages of higher caste with the lower caste which had been earlier not permitted by the text. Kautilya believed in monogamy and the husband had to pay a substantial amount as alimony to the first wife in case he wanted to get married second time. The attitude towards widows also showed greater compassion. A widow could remarry with or without the consent of her in-laws under certain conditions. In this sense, Kautilya was a liberal thinker and his views on widow remarriage could be considered as akin to Raja Ram Mohan Roy in 18th century. In the Kautilyan state a man was not allowed to leave his wife and children without providing them adequate maintenance whereas divorce was a forbidden word in *Manusamriti*. It was given due sanction by Kautilya.

Kautilya believed that whereas *Dharma* is of prime significance, *Artha* and *Kama* must not be ignored. This doctrine taught by Lord *Krishna* to Arjuna in *Bhagvad Gita* had been incorporated in Kautilya's *Arthashastra*, Kautilya advised the king (state) not to recruit vulgar men but to have noble men in various facets of administration of the society since it is the noble men who possess courage and wisdom and have the quality of character. He did not believe nobility to flow from the accident of birth, rather he held

the view that nobility was symbolised by the quality of character.

Kautilya did not believe in withdrawal from the world as the condition for preserving the true freedom of man, rather he emphasised that disinterested action as idealised by *Krishna* could result in a strong organisation. He, therefore, idealised action, the concept of self-discipline so that a strong society based on moral values could be created.

Kautilya believed in a strong central government. He, therefore, campaigned and organised forces to generate a strong centralised state so that it could become a big power to hold on its own.

Kautilyan state made several laws for the welfare of the society. A ban was imposed on the sale and purchase of children as slaves. This shows his immense concern for child labour. Similarly, an employer could not force a female slave to become naked or hurt or abuse or violate her chastity. This indicates remarkable human values which Kautilya cherished against slavery and thus guaranteeing civil rights to *Shudras* which had not been contemplated earlier.

The success of Kautilyan welfare scheme (*Yogakshema*) depended upon how his state (king) dealt with the unfortunate, the weakest, the orphans, the aged, the infirm, the afflicted and the helpless. He emphasised on joint family system as he felt that it was the best way of providing social security to old and disabled members in the family. The central point of Kautilya's welfare state was that the state should help the helpless and leave the able-bodied citizens to seek their own welfare. His scheme of social security via a joint-family system was so comprehensive in nature that it not only emphasised the individual's duty towards his family but also it was the foremost duty of the state (king) to provide social security to those citizens ignored by society.

Health and sanitation was also one of the state's prime concerns. Medical superintendents were appointed by the

state to look after the health of the citizens. Doctors can be punished because of their negligence of duty.

Kautilya was very much in favour of a well-planned city with regulated life. Planned city consisted of different sections for different *Varnas*.

Kautilya was also aware of the environmental problems. Therefore, he prescribed different roads for carrying dead bodies.

Consumers were protected in Kautilyan scheme of *Yogakshema* against any kind of mischief regarding rates or quality of the goods. The protection of the interest of the consumer was upper-most concern of the state.

It is amazing to note that Kautilyan state took measures to protect the common people against anti-social practices of the professional classes like actors, dancers, singers, etc., even in those times.

Morality was given the supreme importance. Laws were made to control manufacturing of liquor, drugs, etc. Gambling and prostitution were also regulated to control the degradation of morals.

We can say that the concept of welfare state was interwoven in the Kautilyan society itself and society was always involved in the *Yogakshema* of the people. In fact, the area of social welfare was much larger than that of state welfare. The state was to protect people only in those situations when society with its voluntary, charitable, philanthropic associations was not coming forward. For example, the state promoted self-employment and did not guarantee state employment for the reason that men felt more free when self-employed than working under government bureaucracy.

Notes and References

1. Choudhary, R.K., (1971), *Kautilya's Political Ideas and Institutions*, Chowkhamba Publications, Varanasi, p. 256.
2. Mookerji, Radha Kumud, (1952), *Chandragupta Maurya and his Times*, Rajkamal Publications, Bombay, p. 54.

3. Choudhary, R.K., (1971), *Op. Cit.*, p. 270.
4. Raja, C.K., (1950), *Some Aspects of Education in Ancient India*, Vasata Press, Madras, p. 42.
5. Choudhary, R.K., (1971), *Op. Cit.*, p. 260.
6. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *The Kautilyan Arthasastra*, Part-III, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, p. 152.
7. *Ibid*, p. 152.
8. Vigasin, A.A. and A.M. Samozvantse, (1985), *Society, State and Law in Ancient India*, Sterling Publishers, Delhi, 1985, p. 83.
9. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *Op. Cit.*, p. 153.
10. Shamasastry, R., (1956), *Kautilya's Arthasastra*, Sri Raghuveer Printing Press, Mysore, p. 173.
11. Radhakrishnan, S., (1948), *The Bhagavad Gita*, Blackie & Son, Delhi, pp. 44-45.
12. Drekmeier, Charles, (1962), *Kingship and Community in Early India*, Stanford University Press, California, USA, p. 26.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
15. Radhakrishnan, S., (1948), *Op. Cit.*, p. 247.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 353.
17. Drekmeier, Charles, (1962), *Op. Cit.*, p. 157. (Arthashastra; "Prosperity depends on effort ... readiness is the king's vow").
18. *Ibid.*, p. 159.
19. Sinha, B.P., (1976), *Reading in Kautilya's Arthashastra*, Agam Prakashan, Delhi, p. 177.
20. Chaudhary, R.K., (1971), *Op. Cit.*, p. 256.
21. Shamasastry, R., (1956), *Op. Cit.*, pp. 205-06.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 207.
23. Rao, M.V.K., (1958), *Studies in Kautilya*, Oriental Publishers, Delhi, p. 231.
24. Ghoshal, U.N., (1927), *A History of Hindu Political Theories*, Oxford University Press, London, p. 89.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 90.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
27. Shamasastry, R., (1956), *Op. Cit.*, pp. 188-89.
28. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *Op. Cit.*, p. 161.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 160-61.
30. Sinha, B.P., (1976), *Op. Cit.*, p. 7.

5

ECONOMIC DIMENSION

There had always been abundant natural resources in India. The people utilised the produce of these natural resources for living. Economic ideas developed scientifically much later. The people habitually invoked gods for their protection and prosperity in the *Vedic* and post-*Vedic* period. Economy was, thus, related to welfare.

India has a unique tradition of tracing the origin of almost every science to the gods. Economics, which was a part of *Nitishastra* and *Rajdharma*, was no exception. The *Mahabharata* mentions that *Brahmana* propounded a theory of '*Trivarga*' of various aspects of *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kama*. The writers of *Nitishastra*, *Rajdharma*, *Arthshastra* and *Dandaniti* discussed various topics that were described in *Trivarga*. The word *Artha* has been used in various texts at a number of places, denoting wealth and the wealth-earning activities in society.

Indian philosophy was wedded to spiritual life where wealth as a symbol of materialism was considered to be of secondary importance. *Moksha* (Salvation) was considered the ultimate goal of life and material wealth only a means to attain that ultimate goal. The *Vedic* ideal demonstrated a blend of spiritual and material welfare. Although *Vedas* laid great emphasis on *Sachidananda* (truth), yet the importance of wealth was not undermined. For the *Vedic* seers wealth was always a means to an end but they considered it a necessary means. But with the passage of time and with the emergence of *Arthashastra* school as an offshoot of traditional *Dharmashastra* mainstream, there was lot of oscillation between spiritualism and materialism. There had been shifts from one aspect of life to another from time to time. According to Sukra "Man is a slave of *Arth*, *Arth* is not slave of anybody. Therefore, a person who desires *Arth* (wealth) should make effort for it."[1] This philosophy was not acceptable to the traditionalists as it was considered a major shift from traditional *Vedic* ideals. *Brahaspati* was acclaimed as an ancient *Guru* of the *Aryans* as he adhered to the traditional values. These two philosophies of life of the *Vedic* period had influenced the post-*Vedic* thinkers. Society was undergoing a metamorphosis. The post-*Vedic* thinkers appreciated a more rational and pragmatic approach towards life. Thus there was a shift towards materialism. Kautilya represented a more realistic approach towards reconstruction of society.

According to Sukra, knowledge can be divided in four parts: (a) *Anviksiki* (Philosophy), (b) *Trayi* (vedic love), (c) *Vartta* (Economics), (d) *Dandaniti* (Politics). *Anviksiki* sharpens the mind and makes it fit for thinking, speaking and acting correctly and properly in all situations of life. Through the knowledge of *Vedas*, one can know what is right and what is wrong, what is useful and what is useless, what are the duties of the *Varnas* and the *Ashramas*. *Dandaniti* explains about the authority of the king, restrictions on the king, use of *Bala* (*Danda*) and

punishment. *Arthashastra* is one of the four branches of knowledge. *Arthshastra* (science of economics according to modern definition) has different connotation. *Arthashastra* in the *Vedic* and post-*Vedic* period was not economics alone but it also encompassed sociology, politics and administration. Sukra defines *Arthashastra* in the following manner: "*Arthashastra* is the science which discusses the duties of the king in accordance with the scriptures. It also studies the methods of collection of wealth."[2] Sukra's definition is quite explicit in respect of the subject-matter and scope of Economics. Sukra has defined wealth and even given a rudimentary analysis of the theory of price. One finds a mention of price by Panini also.[3]

According to Kautilya "*Arthashastra* describes the ancient ideas of the former *Acharyas* related to the acquisition and protection of the country with its people."[4] Acquisition of territory (kingdom) and wealth and devising various methods to support and protect it was the prime objective of the king. It was largely a study of the king's duties of which the welfare of his subjects was the foremost. This meant that it was a study of the political, administrative and economic activities of the state. But these thinkers felt that the scope was narrow and another branch of *Arthashastra* was developed which was called *Varttashastra* or *Vartta.*

Panini in his *Ashtadhyayi* defines *Varttashastra*, "The body of knowledge which studies agriculture, trade and animal husbandry, the main means of livelihood of the society."[5] The word *Vartta* is derived from *Vritti* which means livelihood. *Vartta* has been studied in relation to labour, production, distribution and exchange by ancient Indian thinkers. *Vartta* indicated national economy and was the source of life. It crystallized a branch of learning and was devoted to the systematic study of the material interests of the people, their economic welfare, its preservation and development.

Brahaspati in his *Arthashastra* has given the following definition of *Vartta*. "It is a study of agriculture, cow rearing and trade."[6]

Sukra was the first writer who included banking or moneylending as an integral part of *Vartta*. He defines *Varttashastra* in the following manner: "*Vartta* includes moneylending, agriculture, trade and cow rearing. The people involved in *Vartta* became prosperous and fearless."[7] The same definition of *Vartta* is given in *Mahabharata*. "*Vartta* includes agriculture, commerce, cow-rearing and different sorts of handicrafts."[8]

The *Mahabharata* refers to Arjuna as a scholar of *Arthashastra* at several places and to his conviction that without *Artha* (wealth) the fulfilment of other three ideals (*Dharma, Kama and Moksha*) is not possible. Arjuna considered poverty as the greatest evil on earth and stated that it may be suitable for the ascetic but not for the king.[9] *Artha* has been considered one of the four ideals — *Purusharthas* — placed before mankind. Here, it means material welfare. Kautilya means by this term, the land inhabited by the people and considered *Arthashastra* as the science that helps in the acquisition and development of the land and its people. According to him, *Artha* also means the livelihood of the people. Although ancient scholars were not familiar with the modern division of Economics into consumption, production, exchange and distribution, but they had some awareness of the processes of production and consumption. According to Sukra, "Consumption is the utilization of wealth for the protection of the living people. The wealth spent on the acquisition or protection of things like corn, cloth-house, garden, elephant, chariot-learning, kingdom and more wealth is consumption."[10] The ancient thinkers did not consider consumption as a separate activity but an activity which only formed a part of production. All applications of wealth for the production of more wealth for the welfare of the people has been called consumption.

Arthashastra was a very comprehensive science and it was not simply a study of the economic activities of individual, society and the state but it included almost all the duties of the state. *Arthashastra*, thus, was conceived as a study of *Vartta* and *Dandaniti*. The king had two foremost duties — one was to support the people and the other was to liquidate anti-social elements. *Vratta* and *Dandaniti* went together.

For Kautilya, there are four categories of sciences, namely, logic (*Tarkashastra*), three *Vedas* (*Trayi*), economics (*Vartta*) and jurisprudence of polity (*Dandaniti*).

LAND SETTLEMENT

For good material living, three major vocations were recognised as providing men with the means of livelihood: *Krishi* (Agriculture), *Pashupalya* (Cattle rearing) and *Vanijya* (trade). The three together constitute *Vartta*. Like all activity in the state, *Vartta* too is rooted in the country (*Janapadamula*). "There can be no kingdom without a country or territory."[11] In analysing the evolution of economic development in ancient India, we have to assess the requirements of society at that time. In spite of abundant natural resources, the native population had to be settled and had to acquire skills to exploit these resources. To harness these resources, the state had to work in a planned manner for its prosperity by implementing policies of economic growth.

No growth could be achieved without a *Janpada* and for the prosperity of *Janpada* it was essential to settle natives in villages. Kautilya met this problem of settlement by building new villages on new sites or on old ruins. This was achieved by encouraging avoidance of congestion in existing villages by a transfer of the excess population to the new settlements contemplated under the project, and by inducing people to migrate from other lands and reside there. The overcrowding in the rural areas which was sought

to be relieved by the rehabilitation of old abandoned sites or the formation of new settlements, as aimed at by the land development policy, was due to the relatively limited prospects offered to a growing population in existing villages for employment, either as cultivators or as artisans. The diversion of the surplus population to new sites was expected to lead to increasing agricultural operations and industrial activities.

To ensure well-being of the people, Kautilya settled the limit of newly founded villages to a maximum number of five hundred families with a minimum of one hundred families.[12] This shows that the family is to be reckoned as the unit for purposes of allotment of land under the scheme. If on an average a family consisted of five members, the total population in a new village to begin with will vary from 500 to 2,500. The distance between two neighbouring villages was to be one *Krosha* or two *Kroshas* at the most. One can conclude, that the policy was to create a uniform pattern of comparatively small villages by limiting the number of settlers to prevent congestion as far as possible in the areas to be developed. It seems that the idea was to have more small villages and to make them inter-dependent so that the scheme could work with greater ease, rather than having big settlements with their extended needs, making it impossible for the state to satisfy them at the time of building up the colonies. It was felt that this scheme of settlement was initially suited for enterprises developing under the system of inter-related small village units.

Another aspect of Kautilya's land development policy was to develop abandoned sites. With the vacation of a particular site, the earlier inhabitants lost all rights on the previous settlements. This was done to ensure easy settlement of new colonies with no disturbance from the previous settlers so that no time is lost in litigation or brawls.

As an economic entity the country was reckoned as of paramount importance. Its natural resources were of great

use and the climate influenced the commercial life of the people. Kautilya regarded the country as the source of all wealth. According to Kautilya, the following were the prerequisites for the economic growth and prosperity of the country, ingredients of a welfare state could be found in these prescriptions, as family was the basic unit of welfare and not the individual:

(i) Capital cities should exist in the centre of its territory;
(ii) The land should be productive — land should have abundant water, yield crops and suitable for grain crops — as the state was interested in cultivation;
(iii) Settlement of excess population in the newly reclaimed areas;
(iv) Provision of employment;
(v) The *Janpada* (territory) should comprise of land and waterways· and
(vi) Inhabitants should be active, alert, of good habits, loyal and of good character; a lot of emphasis was laid on morality.

The land development policy, it is felt, was intended to benefit *Shudras* and cultivators, and provide relief to the lower economic strata, the artisan class and the peasantry. Kautilya measures the accommodation to be granted on a family basis, taking generally the head of a family as a contracting party. More importance is given to the family and not to the individual. This land remained impartible with no risk of fragmentation. When the possession of a plot was confined for generations in the same family on a life interest basis, the limited right of ownership could develope into permanent hereditary holding.

AGRICULTURE

It is obvious from the land development scheme that all the unoccupied land belonged to the state. Unoccupied land was to be given to the cultivator interested to till the land. The parties to such a contract of holding the lands were always the head of the families. There were basically two types of cultivators — (i) owners, (ii) tenant farmers.

Among the owner farmers were those farmers (i) who were interested in cultivation but had no land to cultivate, (ii) the land that was ready for agriculture but was given to those farmers who were ready to pay the taxes with a provision that they were not full owners and the land would be taken away from them if they were not able to till the land. The state helped these settlers with seeds, cattle and even cash, so that the land may be reclaimed. These loans were to be recovered at the tenants' convenience. Various types of concessions and remissions in taxes were recommended at the time of the first settlement.

Apart from this, there was another type of ownership — that of gifted lands. These gifts and grants were made to *Brahmanas*, scholars and various other people from time to time as reward for their services towards the nation. These gifts amounted to exemption from state dues and unrestricted and continuous use of the produce of the land. Grants of lands were recommended to *Adhyakshas*, accountants and other lower officials. They had no right to sell or mortgage the grant. They could only make use of the land. These properties were non-transferable. An important point that needs to be mentioned here is that these grants were not treated as *Jagirs* of later days. These grants did not enable them to establish feudal rights.[13]

IRRIGATION

Basically agricultural lands depended on the rain gods implying plenty of natural resources of water, like rivers and lakes. Insufficiency of these resources compelled the state to exploit alternative sources for irrigation.

Setubandha or irrigation works formed an important activity of the state in the field of agriculture. The word *Setu* refers primarily to the embankment or dam built for holding water. Two types of *Setus* were distinguished:

(i) *Sahodaka Setu* — tanks, wells etc.
(ii) *Ahbaryodaka Setu* — storing of water in reservoirs by means of embankments.

Of the two types of *Setus*, the *Sahodaka Setu* was preferred by the state leading us to believe that preference was probably due to less capital intensity, it served the purpose of irrigation having minimum burden on the national exchequer.

Irrigation was primarily a state activity but there is mention of privately owned irrigation tanks. The ownership of the tank was lost if it was not utilised for five years, except that if the owner was in distress, he could sell or mortgage his tank.

Another important feature of irrigation in agricultural land development was that at the time of new settlements cooperative efforts were encouraged for building new water-works with the intention of persuading members with labour or cash contribution. This was done keeping in mind the aim of collective responsibility in nation-building.

STATE REVENUE THROUGH AGRICULTURE

Agricultural yields constituted the most important part of state revenue. It comes in the form of either *Sita*, i.e., the produce of crown lands and *Bhaga*, i.e., one-sixth share of

the produce of other lands. The state's share was divided either on the threshing floor or the farmers brought them to the state granaries. The land revenue was classified as under:

(i) *Sita* — the produce of the crown land,
(ii) *Bhaga* — the king's share of produce,
(iii) *Bali* — The kings receipts from beggings,
(iv) *Kara* — periodical taxes.

The *Arthashastra* further classifies revenue into three parts:

(i) *Anayajata* — accidental revenue,
(ii) *Vartamana* — running revenue, and
(iii) *Paryusita* — outstanding revenue.[14]

The agricultural produce of royal fields forms an independent item of revenue separate from the group (country part) *Rashtra*. "The *Rashtra* comprises of :

(i) *Pindakara* — lumpsum assessment,
(ii) *Sadbhaga* — the sixth share of the harvest,
(iii) *Senabhakta* — the provisions for the army,
(iv) *Bali* — the king's receipts from beggings,
(v) *Kara* — periodical taxes,
(vi) *Utsanga* — earning from presents,
(vii) *Parsava* — margin tax,
(viii) *Parihinika* — damage fee,
(ix) *Anpoyanika* — income from presents, and
(x) *Kaustheyaka* — the income from the king's store houses".[15]

The agricultural produce of the crown lands fell within the scope of superintendent of agriculture (*Sitadhyaksha*). At the outset Kautilya defines *Sita* as comprising 'all kinds

of produce that are brought in by the superintendent of agriculture.' *Sitadhyaksha* was responsible for carrying out agricultural operations. He had to supervise the distribution of seeds and get the land ploughed and sown by *Dasas*, *Karamkaras*, and *Dandapratikartrs*. These slaves were labourers in state services and offenders who had to render service in lieu of non-payment of fines imposed upon them. They could not be compared with tenant farmers.

Vapatiriktam system refers to a system under which "an amount equal to the seed sown is deducted from the gross produce of the field and handed over to the tenant, the balance being then divided between the king and the tenant." E.H. Johnston explains it in the following manner: "They may pay a share other than those set out earlier, as may be agreed on" except in cases "where the king's stocks of grain are deficient," when apparently the land is to be cultivated by the king's officers instead of being let out on favourable terms to the tenants.[16]

As for irrigation, the cultivators had to pay for the king's own irrigation works water rates amounting to one-fifth, or one-fourth or one-third according as the water derived from manual labour, animal labour, or machines: they had to pay one-fourth when the water was drawn out of rivers, lakes, reservoirs and wells. Besides, the *Sitadhyaksha* had to grow winter and summer crops in the low lands according to the supply of water available for the irrigation.

There are clear indications about private ownership of land. The *Ksetrika*, the owner of the field, is distinguished from *Upavasa*, the tenant.

As regards disputes for boundaries between two fields, either party could prove. As claim, the disputed portion used to go to the king. The land whose owner (*Pranastasvamikam*) could not be traced, also used to go to the state.

"In support of the view that all land belongs to the state, Breleor refers to the rule that everything found in the earth, ore, minerals, treasures belonged to the state. It is

true that the mines are clearly owned by the state. But it is doubtful that it proves anything about ownership of agricultural land. As to treasures, it is only such treasures as are unclaimed by anyone in a legitimate manner that become state property. One may grant that the king's domain or sovereignty extends over the entire territory of the kingdom. But without detriment to that sovereignty, the subjects could own various kinds of property, including even land. It is possible that the rule that all land belongs to the king reflects on earlier stage in the development of society when all land was the property of the entire tribe and the king as the chief representing the tribe was regarded as the owner of the land. But when over the generations, individual families continued to hold and till the same separate pieces of land, a vested interest was created, which practically amounted to ownership of the separate pieces of land. Then the rights of alienation came to be recognised. Kautilya's *Arthasastra* reflects this state of affairs."[17]

Sita was the collective output of the royal farms, the *Bhaga* was the king's customary share of the produce levied on the ordinary revenue-paying lands. *Bhaga* or *Sadbhaga* did not fall under the jurisdiction of *Sitadhyaksha*. The controlling authority for the collection in kinds and other revenue was *Samahartr*, Kautilya uses the term *Sadbhaga* (sixth share of the crop) instead of *Bhaga* for rates of tax. "*Arthasastra* explains how one-sixth of the grain share was traditionally held in its time to have been paid by the subjects at the beginning of kingship, while the hermits living in the forest still paid the royal contribution from their gleanings at this specific rate."[18] The reference here is from Kalidasa's famous drama *Shakuntala* where this kind of payment of share to the king is mentioned. The king's share was assessed in *Arthashastra* on different rates for different classes of soils.

The term *Bali* is defined as the ten-fold, the twenty-fold and the like, charges in case of the sixth-share as prevalent in specified tracts. *Bali* stands for an undefined cess over and above the kings normal share of the produce.

Kara was a general property tax levied periodically. *Pindakara* comprises taxes levied upon whole village. It was a lump assessment upon village as distinguished from king's grain share assessed upon the individual cultivators.

The *Senabhakta* was 'the kings dues of oils, rice, and the like payable at the time of marching of the army.'

In the great revenue roll of kingdom which was to be prepared by the *Samahartr*, the contributions paid by the villages in grain, cattle, cash and raw materials and the like, were required to be entered separately. One of recognised branches of revenues in the *Smritis* where the cattle-tax is assessed at the standard rate of 1/50th of the produce. From Kautilya's mention of 'benevolences' *Pranaya* was levied on breeders of animals, it may be surmised that some kind of charge was imposed upon them during normal times. Contribution in unpaid labour, like contribution in cash was expected to be entered by the *Gopa* in his register of houses. According to *Arthashastra* that unpaid labour was natural under the circumstances.

Arthashastra includes under the class country-part (*Rashtra*), pastures (*Vivita*) and ropes for binding thieves (*Chorarajju*).[19] The superintendent of pastures had set up pasture-lands in troublesome areas lying between the villages. He was to make the lower forest region safe from thieves and wild animals. The *Adhyakshas* had to arrange for the means of subsistence with respect to forests of different kinds to provide for transit duties, to dig wells, to plant gardens, to escort caravans, to protect the cattle of the villages. The village headman had to compensate the caravan for theft or removal of their goods within the village limits. Pasture *Adhyaksha* was liable for their loss on the village boundary.

The above services could be drawn into the sources of royal revenue. *Vartani* (transit duties) is mentioned apart from the 'pasture-land' in the list of revenues under the class *Rashtra*. The function of tracking criminals shared by the *Adhyaksha* with the officer for arresting thieves would

certainly entail a fee to be charged from the villagers for this special service. The same was apparently the case with *Goadhayaksha.*

ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION OF LAND REVENUE

The *Arthashastra* mentions branches of *Samahartr's* function as :

(i) The purchase and sale and putting out to interest of grain received;
(ii) Barter of one class of grain with another;
(iii) Begging of grain; and
(iv) Loan of the grain.

The king's share instead of being stored in the royal granary was put to the best investment. The deficiency in supply to the royal granary was met by loans.

Regarding weights and measures, Kautilya's *Arthashastra* mentions that the balance for weighing the king's receipts (*Ayamani*) which differs from the balance in general use (*Vyavaharika*). He lays down the general rule that an excess of five per cent should be paid when things other than specified articles are weighed in the balance called *Samavrtta* and *Parimani.*

In Kautilya's *Arthashastra* the *Samahartr* was the officer charged with the collection of all kinds of revenue. He had four *Sthanikas* and *Gopas* working under him. Their major duties were:

(i) Division of kingdom into four parts;
(ii) Arrangement of total number of villages; and
(iii) Preparation of written record (*Nibandha*) on revenue-free land.

The *Gopas* had to ascertain the total area by inspecting the village boundaries, and also to ascertain the

total areas of cultivated and uncultivated land, up-land, low-land plots, gardens etc. The functions of the *Gopas* can be compared to the modern *Patwaris*.[20]

Not only does the *Arthashastra* give us a classified list of various branches of land-revenue and the principles of their assessment, but in its description one may detect routine administration and the outline of a definite agricultural policy. The principal aim of this policy was to exploit the resources of the kingdom to the advantage of the state treasury without bearing harshly or unkindly upon cultivators.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

Trade, both internal and external, began much earlier in India. In the *Vedas*, we find a number of references which prove beyond doubt that trade and commerce were known to the ancient Aryas. "In the *Atharva Veda* there is a prayer addressed to *Indra* and *Agni* asking them to make trade safe for the traders by destroying the robbers and dangerous animals so that they may earn wealth".[21]

The trade as described in Kautilya's *Arthashastra* has two sectors — private and public. Generally, private trade was allowed to function but with a number of limitations. The idea was to guarantee the traders reasonable profits, the state a decent income and the people a fair supply of goods at a fair price. A large number of rules and regulations were provided by Kautilya to bring harmony amongst diverse interests. Kautilya sought to recognise mutually conflicting interests of the profit-seeking merchants, the money-grabbing state and the purchasing community. Careful planning and contemplation was done to devise measures for the same. Basically, it was a balancing act between the interests of the state, the traders and the consumers. An appreciable portion of business and industry was beyond the scope of the private sector. It could

also not operate freely in the field of foreign trade because of certain rules prohibiting imports of specified articles.[22]

Apart from the trade in private hands, the state engaged itself in trade on a fairly extensive scale. All trade was under state control. The superintendent of trade '*Panyadhyaksha*' was incharge of all the trade. His major duty was to fix the prices of various commodities. He fixed prices taking into consideration the following:

(i) Investment of capital,
(ii) Interest charges,
(iii) Duties paid, and
(iv) Rent etc.

If there was glut of any commodity, the *Panadhyaksha* had to intervene and centralise the sale to that particular commodity so that the price did not slump. One may understand from this that the entire supply was purchased and its sale carried out through the agency of the state at a fixed price. No price was fixed above the price fixed by the state for any commodity. There was centralized distribution of goods. Goods with extensive demand were distributed centrally. The objective for doing so was to make it possible for the sale at a price which would fetch an initial profit. Care was taken in watching that the demand did not decline and when it was found that the demand is sustained, the price was already higher than expected through distribution and prices in different markets were made higher still under conditions which were strategically controlled by the state for commodities with easy availability. Indigenous goods belonging to the state were sold at one place. This was done to avoid competition with private traders. Imported goods were sold at different centres. This was done for the reason that such imports were comparatively limited and the consumers could secure them easily at a rate which was not unprofitable to the state.

In private trade, services of those who may be standing between producers and dealers were usefully employed.

These persons constituted an indispensable element of the trade system. These persons functioning as 'middle-men' did not have a share in the profit reserved for the dealers, nor were they allowed in law to earn a profit for themselves in the course of the transactions conducted by them. Their counterparts in the public sector were members of the mercantile block with whose help the state carried on its own trade with foreign countries. They had to work according to the state policy. They were given maintenance allowance which was the sum agreed upon as a reasonable proportion of the gross sale. The appointment of the middleman was not wholly on a maintenance basis. They were understood to have been paid commission for their work. According to Kautilya, only 'authorised' persons should be employed as middlemen. The middleman was punishable for any offence committed by him within the sphere of his limited activities. One understands from this that although the middleman worked for his employer, he had personal liability to the state also.[23]

PRICING

The fair price idea had always been a foremost criterion in Kautilya's planning for the economic development of the country. For understanding this, one has to go back and look at his idea of "In the happiness of his subjects lies his (king's) happiness, in their well-being, his well-being; he should regard as conducive to his well-being not what pleases himself, but what pleases his subject." [24] The idea was to protect the interests of the consumers. The following major factors were considered in the determination of prices of commodities:

(i) Prices were fixed inclusive of 5% profit for indigenous goods;

(ii) Prices were fixed inclusive of 10% profit for imported goods;

(iii) Demand was not allowed to decline;
(iv) Sale of goods in open market;
(v) No wide gap in demand and supply; and
(vi) Control of prices through regulation.

Although a working idea for a fair price was behind the policy of trade and commerce, yet the prices were not dictated from above. A close scrutiny of the system reveals that prices were determined keeping in view the coat, fixed rate of profit and chargeable duty. Fixing the rate of profit and regulating prices through government action was a positive step towards curbing the evil of inflated prices. The tendency to charge maximum profit by marketeers not only makes the access of commodities to consumers difficult but also leads to black-marketing and as a consequence give rise to the ghastly phenomenon of black money in the country. Kautilya strongly opposed the creation of such conditions in the society and this explains his penchant for state regulation of prices.

The amount of profit fixed at 10% for imported goods indicates that the state wanted to encourage foreign trade. Moreover, it needed a broad base to import foreign merchandise for which a larger outlay was required and it could only be provided with the help of private traders. One can conclude from this that the fear of recession in private trade due to fixing a maximum 5% rate of profit on indigenous goods could be counterpoised by doubling the profit on imports. Thus the traders' interest in the trade stays intact. Difference in earning between the controlled price and the price charged by the trader in view of competition among buyers, the increase in price together with the duty went to the state treasury if the price of any merchandise was increased much beyond the controlled price; because of bidders increasing the price, the king received the enhanced amount of toll on it.

A careful perusal of the prohibited list of imports makes it clear that the state rightly exercised monopoly

in trade of commodities which might be used as military equipment, or would be necessary to fill the state treasury; otherwise influx of precious stones from abroad would create monetary crisis and consequent economic disorganisation. It was also very wise to retain the monopoly right of import of grains and cattle, the two most essential items of agricultural property. Unrestricted import of these articles by private traders could ruin native agriculture and cattle market. This restriction served the same purpose as the passing of the Corn Law in England.

Hoarding was severely punished. For hiding inferior commodities, eight times the amount of toll was imposed, and in case superior commodities were hoarded, they were wholly confiscated.

Thus the concept of just price, true to conditions actually prevailing in the market, can give protection in varying degrees to all interests concerned even under strained circumstances. A capricious price is not a just price. Inflation, engineered by profiteers, such as cornering by a sort of cartel, or bidding over the declared price with a view to its enhancement, was not allowed. If bidders compete to increase price, it was the state that got all the benefit, and the trader none.

Kautilya favoured consumption in economic enterprise. This is evident from the following:

(i) Kautilyan *Arthashastra* has a regulation to fix market prices considering cost of production. Kautilya knew the theory that in competition, prices are equal to cost of production. If the state fixes prices on the basis of cost of production, it implies in economic theory that it follows the policy of competition.

(ii) Price of 'royal' goods also should be beneficial to the consumers.

(iii) Kautilya feared that trading profits might be excessive. In competition, average profits are

recovered in the market price. On this criterion, Kautilyan state was in favour of competition.

(iv) Kautilya centuries ago devised anti-monopolistic regulations. Hence strict supervision of market and penalties for combinations were prescribed by Kautilya. These regulations were for promoting competition and penalising monopolies.

Kautilyan *Arthashastra* is not of local or ancient significance. It has attributes of a liberalistic policy. In this realm of competition in trade, it has a universal message.

STANDARDISATION OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

Weights and measures used in trade are to be manufactured by the *Pandyadhayaksha*, responsible for their standardisation. Their private manufacture was not allowed. Details about the different weights and measures are given in *Arthashastra*. "A large number of balances called *Tula* are described. From the description it appears that these were not the usual pair of scales, but rather balances of steelyard type, with two unequal arms, one marked with figures from zero to one hundred to indicate the weight in *Palas* of the article suspended from the other end. The text also mentions the prices at which the weights and measures are to be sold to traders."[25]

The 'fair price idea' is indissolubly bound up with the necessity of strictly adhering to the use of correct weights and measures and separating inferior types of commodities from the superior ones as well as the collection of duties according to prescribed rates which may not be possible if these necessary conditions for an accurate assessment are not fulfilled.

Revenue from Weights and Measures

There is another class of revenue belonging to the 'fortified city', i.e. 'weights' and measures'. It includes *Ayamani*, by which the king's receipts are weighed, which weighs on hundred *Dharanpalas* unlike the balance for general use which weighs only ninety-five *Dharanpalas*. The different standards appear for different purposes, one for measuring goods received in the treasury, (*Ayamana*) another, a lower one, for use in trade (*Vyavaharika*), a third, lower still for payments to be measured out from treasury (*Bhajana*) and a fourth, lowest of all, for deliveries to be made to the palace (*Antahpurabhajana*).[26] The intention apparently is to secure double advantage to the state, which receives payments by a larger measure but pays out with a smaller one. Obviously, this provides revenue to the State.

Another kind of income was that the traders were to pay a punching or stamping fee (*Prativedhanikam*) every four months at a rate of one *Kakani* every day to the superintendent of weights and measures. This was done to ensure that no irregularities are practised by the trade with regard to weights and measures to the inconvenience of consumers.

Revenue from Trade

The group of charges (consisting of octroi duties, transit charges, custom duties, etc.) fall under two distinct classes — (i) fortified city (*Durga*), (ii) the country-part (*Rashtra*).

Under the 'fortified city' the *Arthashastra* includes the following items:

(i) *Shulka* (tolls or octroi duties),
(ii) *Dvanadeya* (gate duties),
(iii) *Sura* (liquor),
(iv) *Pautavam* (weights and measures), and
(v) *Panya-Samstha* (market).

"As regards the *Shulka* and *Dvardeya*, Kautilya mentions the functions of superintendent of tools (*Shulkadyaksha*), that tolls both for import and export are to be levied upon goods produced in the country-part and the capital city as well as those brought from outside the kingdom. The rate of duty upon imported goods in general is declared to be one-fifth of the value, but a distinct schedule of rates is laid down for specific goods."[27]

The following are the notable features of tolls in *Arthashastra*:

(i) Duties are levied in cash after valuation by appraisers;
(ii) Special experts were engaged for precious goods; and
(iii) Duties were very low on perishable articles, valuable products and ordinary commodities.

Another kind of income accrued to the state under the head *Shulka*. When the price was raised due to competition amongst buyers, the excess along with *Shulka* went to the king's treasury.

It is evident from the above discussion that in Kautilya's time, the state was in an advanced stage of development so far as the department of revenue was concerned.

Arthashastra presents the outlines of what may be called a tariff policy, which is marked by moderation and good sense. The general rule laid down was that whatever merchandise was a source of affliction to the kingdom should be destroyed, while merchandise which were difficult to procure and productive of great benefit should be free of toll.

Another branch of revenue was income from liquors (*Sura*) and intoxicants (*Madya*). The term *Sura* occurs as an independent branch of revenue under the class 'fortified city' in the classified list of constituents of the king's

income. The *Suradhyaksha* took care of the manufacture of liquor and the revenue from liquor. On occasions and festivals a general licence was given to drink wine. The following revenues were received from the sale of liquor:

"(i) Proceeds of sale of liquors manufactured by the state.
(ii) Charges imposed upon private manufacturers in the city consisting of (a) *Shulka* of five per cent, (b) indemnity fee (*Vyaji*), (c) compensation fee assessed upon the net profit left after inspection of the daily sale.
(iii) *Shulka* imposed upon the imported liquors and intoxicants."[28]

MARKET

Market was preferred by Kautilya because it was supposed to be the best medium of circulation of merchandise on a wider scale. To make the market policy succeed, a network of planned roads and means of transport was conceived by Kautilya for proper distribution of goods, for the easy accessibility of goods by consumers.

Kautilya recommended the regulation of the market for the benefit of consumers. The rate of profit as well as price were kept low. The state had no sympathy for the profiteers. Thus, it can be inferred that Kautilya aimed at a regulated market economy.

Revenue from Market

The superintendent of markets (*Samsthadhyaksa*) had to supervise the sale and mortgage of old merchandise in the market, and another officer called the superintendent of merchandise (*Panyadhyaksha*) had to fix the prices of various articles. Fines for varying amounts were prescribed for various frauds perpetrated on buyers, for conspiracy for illegal enhancement of prices, for transgression of the price

fixed by state regulation, etc. All these fines deposited in the state treasury were collectively called 'market revenue' by Kautilya.

TRADE ROUTES

"In the matter of the various trade routes, Kautilya, differing from the earlier teachers, has expressed the view that a land-route is to be preferred to a water-route. He argues that the former is open in all seasons and is fraught with comparatively fewer dangers, which, moreover, can be easily overcome. Again he expresses himself in favour of the route to the south as against the Himalayan route preferred by the earlier teachers. He regards the southern route as more profitable since it brings in many valuable commodities like pearls, diamonds, conch-shells and plenty of gold. It would not be unreasonable to conclude from this that trade with the south was negligible in the days of the earlier teachers, but had become more common and more profitable in days of Kautilya." [29]

The state was to maintain a fleet of boats which may be let out on hire to traders and fishermen.

A feature of the inter-country trade was the journey by traders in caravans (*Sartha*). Traders in those days could move from one region to another only in groups because of the danger of being looted on the way by forest tribes and dacoits. Inside the boundaries of a state, it was regarded as the duty of the State to protect the caravans.

Revenue from Trade-routes

The revenue falling under the head 'country-part' comprised of the following:

"(i) Merchant (*Vanik*),
(ii) The warden of rivers (*Nadipala*),
(iii) The ferry (*Tara*),
(iv) Boats (*Navah*),

(v) Port (*Pattnam*), and
(vi) Transit duties (*Vartni*)."[30]

All boats owned by the state were in the charge of the *Navadhyaksha* 'The superintendent of ships'. *Navadhyaksha* supervised the routes of the ships, the navigation of the rivers as well as the ferries over the natural and artificial lakes and rivers. When ferries operated on rivers that form the boundaries between two states, the recovery of custom duties, road-cess and convoy charges from foreign merchants was to be made at the ferry wharf. The villages bordering on the sea and those situated on the banks of rivers and lakes paid a fixed tax (*Clipta*). This tax was regarded as a return for the services rendered by *Navadhyaksha*. The merchants (*Vanik*) paid a duty (*Shulkabhaga*) according to the usages of the ports (*Pattnam*). There were two classes of boats, viz., the royal boats which could be used on payment of hire charges and the private boats which were liable to duty (*Shulka*). The ferrymen (*Tara*), collected the customs duty (*Shulka*), escorting fees (*Ativahika*) and the transit duties (*Vartni*) at the frontiers. Apart from this, the fee paid at the military or police-stations was another item of revenue from the trade-routes. This shows that revenue from trade routes constitute a major part of state treasury and it was the duty of the state to use this revenue for the protection and the preservation of the same (trade routes) which in turn helps people to carry out their business from one place to another easily.

MINING AND OTHER INDUSTRIES

As mentioned in *Isha Upanishada* "Resources are given to mankind for their living, knowledge (Isha) for using them is necessary."[31] In other words, given resources should be converted into goods for living with the help of knowledge. *Isha* is knowledge.

Vartta included *shilp* of various types. Apart from agricultural and cow-rearing, the Aryans were familiar with many crafts and arts. Certain industries went along with agriculture and animal husbandry. The implements used for these had to be manufactured. The major among these were mining and manufacturing industries.

"The importance of mines is stressed in the statement that the treasury depends on mines, that the army is sustained by the treasury and that the earth is conquered by the means of treasury and the army."[32]

The state had a 'director of mines' *Akaradhyaksha*, whose prime duty was to start new mines and renew the old ones. The *Akaradhyaksa* had to be an expert in *Sulbasastra* (Geology) and *Dhatushastra* (Metallurgy). He used to make a survey of the regions where mineral deposits could be found and new mines started. Thus mining was primarily a state activity.

Although all mines were state property, but all of them were not exploited directly by the state. A mine found costly to be exploited was leased out on a fixed share of the output (*Bhaga*), or a fixed rent (*Prakraya*), and only the light mine was exploited directly by the state. This indicates that there was a definite role of the private sector in mining industry but under state supervision.

Workers in the state run mines belonged to the same categories as the workers on crown lands, i.e., *Dasa*, *Karmakara* and *Dandapratikartr*.

The produce of various mines was turned into articles of use in the respective workshops or factories (*Karmantas*). The manufacture of articles other than gold and silver was the concern of *Lohadhyaksha*, who was also in-charge of 'their sale'. The *Khanyadhyaksha* was in-charge of the manufacture of articles from precious stones and their sale.

Articles of gold and silver were manufactured under the supervision of *Swarnadhyaksa*. The duties of the *Sauvarnika*, the royal goldsmith, who manufactured gold

and silver articles for the people in special workshops, were described in the *Arthashastra*. A strict vigil was kept on the employees of these workshops. Precautions against fraud were also indicated in the text.[33]

Revenue from Mines

There is a list of twelve kinds of income which it is said was derived from the mines. These are:

"(i) *Mulya* (Price)
(ii) *Bhaga* (share)
(iii) *Vyaji* (sales tax)
(iv) *Parighaha* (a kind of protective duty)
(v) *Atyaya* (penalty for violation of state monopoly)
(vi) *Sulka* (customs duty for example on imported salt)
(vii) *Vaidharana* (compensation for transfer of state right of sale to private individuals)
(viii) *Danda* (fine)
(ix) *Rupa* (inspection fee of 1/8%)
(x) *Rupika* (charge for manufacture of 8% of the price)
(xi) *Dhatu* (metals)
(xii) *Panya* (commodities manufactured from them)."[34]

Mining and industries based on mining were a valuable source of state income.

Although not mentioned in great detail in the text as well as various books and commentaries on the text, there seems to be few industries that existed in Kautilya's time. The industries existent at that time were of small-scale nature according to the definition of industries in modern times.

The textile industry, of course, is mentioned by Kautilya. But keeping in view the other activities like making articles from metals and precious metals, chariots

for usage in the country and for war, implements for agriculture, implements for mining etc. indicate that a few other industries existed at Kautilya's time. They were:

(i) Woodwork — the wood used to make chariots, chairs, etc. indicate the existence of carpenters.
(ii) Ceramics — artisans made pots and pitchers, toys of clay etc.
(iii) Metal works — Besides iron, copper, gold and silver were used to make ornaments and other articles.

The above observation makes us believe that the industry in Kautilyan period was quite advanced against the claim of non-existence of industries in that period.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Textile industry is the one about which good deal of details are found in the *Arthashastra*. The officer in-charge of the textile industry was called the *Sutradhaksha*. His duties involved getting yarn spun from wool, bark-fibre, cotton, etc. There were separate factories for weaving different types of cloth, cotton, linen, silk, etc. There was a reference to the manufacture of *Kankata* (armours) in separate factories. The *Sutradhaksha* looked after the manufacture of ropes, throngs and straps useful for carts, chariots, etc.[35]

There is no clear indication of the scope of work falling under private or state enterprise. *Karusasitrs* were master artisans, employing a number of artisans to do actual work. The workers got only wages for their work and the master artisan kept the profit for himself. There were *Svavittakarus*, artisans who worked independently with their own capital in their own workshops. The guild '*Sreni*' to which the artisan must be supposed to belong, was to stand guarantee to the customer for loss, damage, etc. caused by the artisan.[36]

The state exercised strict control over the work of the artisans. The artisans had to conform to the increase or decrease in raw material during the process of manufacture. The most serious offence of the artisans was appropriation of material given by customers for manufacture.

"There is a section of debts, in which are laid down rules governing the rates of interest, loans with or without mortgage, the recovery of loans, the liability for the loans contracted by others and so on. The liabilities of the sales agents, *Vaiyavrtyakara*, are also laid down in the same section. Rules governing the revocation of a sale or a purchase are stated in another section. The law of partnership lays down rules about the liability of the partners in different circumstances, the quantum of their share, cheating by partners and so on."[37]

The above description indicates a fair share of the private sector in industry also, but the state played a vigilant role. The industry was regulated by the state. The consumers' protection seems to be the prime objective of the state in formulating rules for the industry.

Provisions for Labour

Kautilya boldly faced problems of labour and tried to solve them by effective legislation. Paid and unpaid were the two types of labour prevalent at that time. Under-paid categories included those persons who did not have their own land, tools and permanent means of livelihood. They were employed as cultivators under farm owners and got fixed share of soil in exchange for their services. Labourers were required for other agricultural operations also. To enhance agricultural production was the *raison d'etre* for the state as agriculture was the main occupation of the state. Besides agriculture, there was mining industry, textile and other small scale industries, but these industries were not too big to absorb all the labour because unlike agriculture, these industries needed skilled labour. Kautilya

made a law that declared "actors, dancers singers, drummers, buffoons and bards are not to be allowed 'to make any disturbance to the work of the villagers'."[38] This was to protect the poor labour and unwary peasantry in villages against victimisation by outsiders acting in disguise. Besides, paid (free) agricultural labourers, workmen were also engaged in various crafts and manufacturing concerns on terms and conditions, as fixed between them and their masters.

Kautilya made it a criminal offence if an *Arya* sells or mortgages the life of an *Arya*. This rule was common to all the four castes and *Mlecchas* form an exception to the rule. The sale or mortgage of the life of a *Shudra* was an offence punishable with fine. These legislations made by Kautilya raised the *Shudras* to the same position as that of three upper castes within the sphere of its operation.

It is remarkable to note that Kautilya was of the view that the economic conditions compel man to sell himself as a slave, i.e., to exchange his freedom for a price, and, secondly, that the condition to which he is reduced is not a kind of forcible subjection to slavery on political or racial grounds. It was customary only in case of *Mlecchas* to have them as slaves. In order to remove the slavery, he made various legislations. For example, a slave is allowed to own property which can be inherited by his relatives, self-earned or received as a gift.

Kautilya visualised the relationship between the slave and his master as that of the debtor and creditor. If and when the debt is cleared, i.e., the ransom paid, the slave is to be restored his/her freedom; otherwise the condition of bondage continues. Being a humanitarian, he felt that the master cannot employ his slave in any 'mean work', such as, carrying the dead, sweeping ordure, urine and the left-overs of food.

"A practical realisation of the economic value of Kautilyan service has shaped the angle from which his obligations are to be standardised in the field of his

employment without prejudice to innate personal dignity which he does not lose as a consequence of enslavement."[39] The law further provides against the use of physical force or abusive language, affording protection to a slave less than eight years of age; against employment in any work for which he has a dislike or sale or mortgage in a foreign country.

The state accepts the private sector as a source of strength to its economy. The state being a monopolist in quite a large number of areas invites the co-operation of private enterprises for the proper utilization of its resources.

Kautilyan contribution in labour legislation aimed at the settlement of just interests of the employer and the employee. The word 'just' means in this case what is found irreducible in the terms to be provided in law. Thus, the wage could be low, but what was more important for Kautilya was the payment of remuneration or dues.

Wage Structure

Wages were fixed for skilled labour and ordinary labour respectively under Labour Regulation. Under this provision, the duties and wages of the labourers were settled between the employer and the labourers before the work starts. This created an effective machinery for the settlement of disputes. These agreements were based upon prevalent lawful usages or agreements. State had little role to play in these agreements.

Payment of wages was of two kinds under the law. One, individually and second, collectively. In the first case, every individual labourer received his wages directly from his employer for the work assigned and carried out. In the second case, the payment was made to a group of labourers employed for a particular work in a collective capacity, each getting his share as agreed between him and the rest of the group. Here, employer was not directly related with the problems of individual labourer's wage. A lumpsum was to be paid for a specific job within a given time period to the

collective body of workers. The agreement was made between the employer and the representative of the workers. The representative was not a middleman but one of the workmen employed. He was a sort of a contractor thriving on commission. This system was much more effective than the capitalist system in which capitalist chose particular kind of workers for their business through agents and that agent squeezed out something from every worker's small wages as a reward for his help in obtaining a job. Unlike this system, in Kautilya's scheme, a workman had a greater chance of getting a better deal in the bargain.

According to Kautilya, the wages should depend upon the skill of the labourer as well as on the total out-turn of his work, that is both the quality and the quantity of the job completed by him. Two basic criteria of fixing the wages were — (i) the quality of material used in the manufacture, and (ii) the amount of work performed.

The quality of material was three-fold — fine, coarse and middle. There was no reference of fixing the working hours. But, when completion in regard to volume of output was so much encouraged in practice, it would be impossible to determine who loses and who gains in this case unless calculation was based on the time taken by each labourer in a specific job in production. So time factor was of supreme importance.

Kautilya was of the view that "the economic system which encourages individual skills of workmen must embrace every branch of industry as it grows in complexity, and produce differences in wages, allowances etc."[40]

Contractual system was also prevalent in Kautilya's time. The workers had to turn out a given amount of output within a specified time for a fixed amount of wages. But this system was limited to skilled labourers only. It was better as it was free from the spirit of competition as well as there was no uncertainty of the quantity of the work completed by the workers.

Ordinarily, the rule for labourers (except women because of social customs) was to work at a fixed place in order to have official supervision conveniently. The wage system advocated in Arthashastra showed a three-fold variety — (i) all the payment of wages was to be made on the completion of the work. The rule regarding payment of wages did not contemplate any payment in advance; (ii) payment of wages during commodity manufacturing (quantity of work also) at different levels indicate a system of periodical payment; (iii) advance payment (though rare) depended totally on worker's liability.

The *Arthashastra* realised that the interest of the employers (capitalist) and the employees (labourers) could not be identical. Therefore, disputes were bound to occur. At this point, the legislation (for the settlement of disputes) became a very important issue specially when the state itself was an employer of labour.

The employer-employee relationship was based on an undertaking in which employer had to pay settled wages to labourers and in return the labourers had to finish the work in time. Violation of this agreement by any one (both employer and employees) was punishable (fine). But in emergencies like illness or an accidental calamity, work could be done by a substitute.

Five ways of settling wages — "(i) by an agreement between the employer and the employee; (ii) by the evidence brought forward by neighbours as witnesses to an agreement that may have taken place; (iii) by reference to local custom and usage; (iv) by the application of a standard either fixed by the State or by appointed experts; and lastly (v) by taking into consideration the amount of work done and the time spent on doing it, with a view to payment in accordance with customary rates."[41] But, Kautilya always preferred the first two methods.

The state permanently fixed rates in regard to three forms of labour only, viz., agricultural labour, the labour of a herdsman and the labour of a trader. But wages for

professional and industrial classes were to be either in accordance with current rates or the rates approved by experts. The rates of agricultural labour were fixed in proportion to total production. In industry also, the rates were in accordance with the value of articles manufactured.

Both the employer and the employee were bound to accept the terms fixed by contract. In case, if there was no agreement or evidence to prove any settlement, the state enforces standard rates fixed by the experts.

There was a Standing Committee appointed by the state for the investigation and the settlement of the disputes of employers and the employees (both agricultural and industrial). It is important to note that Kautilya was of the view that the dispute between employer and employee was not an ordinary dispute between the offender and the offended but a clash of two different interests which could be harmful for growth of the country. Another important function of this Committee was to give sound advice to artisans regarding their financial well-being. The Committee consisted "of three *Pradeshtris* who are entrusted with the task of removing thorns, i.e., obstacle in the path of peace".[42]

Housing accommodation for workmen (those who were employees of the state) was state's concern and the provision related to this matter was an integral part of the city planning. But, there was no such legal obligation to give houses to the employees under private employers.

Kautilya knew that to match the supply of labour with the growing prospect of industry was a pressing problem. Therefore, he insisted on the aid of *Yantra* (mechanical devices) wherever available.

"A dynamic State knows its own method of attracting immigrants from other countries if it has sufficient room for their useful employment".[43] Thus, the planning of new villages by setting surplus population, brought from overcrowded areas, showed that much attention was paid to the utilisation and development of available resources of production of raw materials.

Self-employment was quite prominent at that time. The capitalist or an industrialist could indirectly become the employer of the artisans by buying the manufactured goods of the artisans. The prices of the goods were to be fair. In that case the artisans would not have any lawful right in the profit of the capitalist.

CONCLUSION

It can be safely concluded that the entire economy of Kautilya was geared round the *Yogakshema* (welfare) principle of the people. The prime objectives of the all economic provisions was the welfare and well-being of the citizens.

The entire discussion about the economy in the Kautilyan state brings out the fact that Kautilya's concept of *Yogakshema* (welfare of the people) was based on what is now described as the concept of welfare state, though, in a rudimentary form. He realised that the privileged section of the society could exploit the under-privileged sections and it was, therefore, necessary for the state to intervene on behalf of the under-privileged. The whole concept of regulation of wages by the state is based on this premise.

Kautilya also believed that unregulated price mechanism could affect different classes of people, more especially the labourers, adversely. It could also hurt the interest of production. Simultaneously, a fall in agricultural prices could result in adverse impact on production. An unremunerative price of agricultural produce to the peasants could act as a disincentive for the peasantry and it was, therefore, essential that the state should regulate agricultural prices and ensure minimum support price to the peasants.

It is, indeed, revealing that Kautilya had sown the seeds of welfare state in that period and assigned quite an important role for the state but, at the same time,

recognising the paramountcy of the society over the state. He believed in the regulation of the economy, but not its control or ownership, to strengthen the state on the one hand and the people on the other. The private sector was freely permitted in Kautilyan state to promote production but care was taken that it did not become monopolistic, a feature so prominent in modern welfare state. It had to follow the social norms prescribed by the state, whether in the determination of weights and measures or the determination of profits. Kautilya, therefore, did accept maximization of profits as one of the goals of the society, the other being provision for the needs of the lowest in the society. He believed in reasonable profit by the producer so that the sharing of gains of production could be equitably distributed among the various sections of the society. In this sense, it can be reasonably concluded that the Kautilyan state did have the rudiments of social justice in its structure, social structure being the prime objective of a modern welfare state.

Notes and References

1. Sharma, B.L., (1987), *Economic Ideas in Ancient India Before Kautilya*, Ramanand Vidya Bhawan, Delhi, p. 31.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
3. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 157. According to Panini, "Price is the cost of production plus the profit of the produce".
4. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
9. Cf. Sharma, B.L., (1987), *Op. Cit.*, p. 46.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
11. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *The Kautiliya Arthasastra*, Part-III, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, p. 166.

12. Cf. Sen, B.C., (1967), *Economics in Kautilya*, Sanskrit College, Calcutta, p. 15
13. Cf. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *Op. Cit.*, pp. 171-72.
14. Cf. Ghoshal, U.N., (1929), *Contributions to the History of the Hindu Revenue System*, Calcutta University, Calcutta, pp. 38.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.
17. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *Op. Cit.*, p. 171.
18. Ghosal, U.N., (1929), *Op. Cit.*, pp. 45-46.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
20. Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 60-63.
21. Sharma, B.L., (1987), *Op. Cit.*, pp. 143-44.
22. Sastra-Varma-Kavacha-Loha-Ratha-Ratna-Dhanya Nirvahyam-Nirvahayato ... Panyanasa-Scha.
According to some, exporting of articles named is prohibited in this passage. This is also the view of Dr. R.G. Basak, Bengali Translation, Part I, p. 170. But Meyer points out the difficulty in accepting the proposed interpretation of *Nirvahayati* in this particular case. He holds that both importing and exporting may be indicated in this passage, (p. 177, fn-2), while some take the rule to apply to importing only.
23. Cf. Sen, B.C., (1967), *Op. Cit.*, p. 30.
24. Ghoshal, U.N., (1927), *A History of Hindu Political Theories*, Oxford University, Press, p. 89.
25. Cf. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *Op. Cit.*, p. 180.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 180.
27. Ghoshal, U.N., (1929), *The Hindu Revenue System, Op. Cit.*, pp. 92-93.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.
29. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *Op. Cit.*, p. 179.
30. Ghoshal, U.N., (1920), *The Revenue System, Op. Cit.*, p. 101.
31. Bokare, M.G., (1993), *Hindu Economics*, Janaki Prakashan, Delhi, p. 119.
32. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *Op. Cit.*, p. 182.
33. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 183.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 183.
35. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 185.
36. Cf. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 185-86.
38. Sen, B.C., (1967), *Op. Cit.*, pp. 43-44.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69.

6

ADMINISTRATIVE DIMENSION

Kautilya's *Arthashastra* is a study in detail of the art and the science of governance. The goal of the government can be achieved only through its administration. Kautilya conceives of two goals of the State administration: (i) To make the state financially sound, and (ii) to help people realise the goal of life, i.e. *Trivarga — Dharma, Artha, Kama.* Later *Moksha* was added as the highest aim of life. Of them Kautilya attached greater importance to *Artha* or wealth, for on this depended the welfare of the people.[1]

Kautilya believed that only that state could be stable which was financially sound. And it was through an efficient administration, particularly financial administration, that the state could keep control over business and economy. Prosperous business and economy would lead to prosperous treasury. If the kingdom did not have sufficient funds in the state treasury, the people would

get discontented. This might lead to popular resentment, revolt and revolution.[2] Though Kautilya's *Arthashastra* deals with almost all the aspects of public administration, it is for the reasons stated above that he focussed his attention on financial administration more than the other aspects of public administration. According to textbook, the science of public administration mainly deals with three aspects : the principles of administration, the machinery of the government and the personnel.[3] Kautilya has explicitly dealt with the machinery and the personnel aspects of the administration, while the principles of administration are only implicit in his treatise.

In Kautilya's administrative set up, the king was the sovereign authority. He made all higher administrative appointments. His authority ran through the whole structure of administration. The whole administration, ministers and senior civil servants, were accountable to him. Though Kautilya prescribes that the king must consult his inner and wider councils, yet he did not bind the king by the advice given by the Council. He was free to use his own discretion. Kautilya's administrative system was, therefore, centred round the king.

Though not bound by the advice of the Council, yet Kautilya's king was not beyond law. Kautilya advised the king not to take decisions arbitrarily. For a good governance, the king must deliberate with his ministers. Deliberations with wise men help the king reach sound decisions. In case, the members of his inner Council or cabinet and also the ministers of his Council, with whom he deliberated on important state affairs, were not unanimous, the king was advised to follow the majority decision. Kautilya, thus, favoured the ideas of the king functioning in co-operation with other members of the Council which besides the king consisted of his trusted advisers and heads of various departments.

Then, there was another check on the king's authority. He had to ordinarily work within the limits of

Dharma and morality. His administration was to be guided by the principles of *Dharma*, ethics and morality. An administration based on *Dharma* alone could guarantee welfare of the people. The popular conception of the ancient Hindus was that the king was not a law-maker; he was to act according to the established law and *Dharma* was the supreme law like an unwritten constitution. Though in Kautilya's scheme of things, there was no legislature to keep control over the king, the *Dharma* and the customs of the land acted as restraining forces. Kautilya was of the view that a king who observed *Dharma* attains happiness here and hereafter. For Kautilya, *Dharma* was the ultimate sovereign to which the king was also subjected to. Besides, at the time of coronation, the king took the oath that he would not act in an arbitrary manner and would consider himself as the servant of the people.

Since the king was the centre of all administrative activities, Kautilya rightly paid heed to his personal security. He also emphasized that the king should possess all virtues so that he commands respect and obedience of his people. Kautilya advised the king to work according to a properly framed time table and make himself accessible to the people. One of the main concerns of Kautilya was that the functioning of the king should be such as endears him to his people.

Next to the king in administration was the *Mantri Parishad* (Council of Ministers) which consisted of the *Purohita*, the Prime Minister and other ministers. The king presided over the meetings of the Council of Ministers. The Council of Ministers consisted of the inner body and the outer body. The Prime Minister, the *Purohita* and few others formed an inner body. Kautilya was in favour of a body of three or four members, because neither a smaller body than this nor a bigger one would be conducive to meaningful deliberations and definite decisions. The inner body was concerned with the policy-making while the outer body was charged with carrying out the policy into

action. Though not bound by the advice of the Council, the king generally acted on the considered advice of the best persons in the Council.

Among those who advised the king, the most respected and valued — was the *Purohita*. Only a duly qualified man was appointed *Purohita*. The Prime Minister was the next important person to advise the king.

The main functions of the Council were executive in character. The Council was largely responsible in shaping the policy of the government. The following points engaged the attention of the Council: (i) means of undertaking works including expedition into the enemy's territory; (ii) gathering of resources in men and material in relation to the internal and external policy of the kingdom; (iii) use of discrimination in undertakings with reference to place and time; (iv) means of averting possible dangers and calamities arising from his own state and from that of the enemy; and (v) results arising from such works undertaken.[4]

Kautilya believed that kingship is possible through assistance, a single wheel does not move. V.R.R. Dikshitar, therefore, remarks: "it is thus evident that the Council enjoyed executive powers, and that the king did not generally go against its wishes. Thus, neither the minister nor the king alone could act, but the king with the body of ministers did act."[5]

Kautilya has outlined an administrative organisation based on the hierarchy of agents and different grades and jurisdiction extending right down to the village. The kingdom was divided into provinces, provinces into districts, districts into villages. Each village consisted of 100-150 families. The village was administered by a *Gramika*. Kautilya mentions '*Gopas*' and '*Sthanikas*' as the country-officials.

The province or *Janapada* was governed by *Samahartha* (Collector-General). The province was divided into districts, districts were placed under *Sthanikas*. Districts were divided into *Dronmukhas*; *Dronmukhas* into *Karwatika* and *Karwatika* into *Sangrahan*.

The *Gramika*, assisted by the village assembly, looked after the village administration. The village assembly was a popular body consisting of the elders of the village. The assembly headed by *Gramika* decided local matters, resolved small civil disputes and petty criminal cases. The *Gramika* was the link between the village administration and the Central Government. Above the village headman was the *Gopa*. He was in-charge of a number of villages. His duty was to supervise the administration of the *Gramikas* under him. Above the *Gopa* was *Sthanika*, who was in-charge of the administration of division or district. Above *Sthanika* was the Governor of the province, who himself was subject to the central administration. At the central administration level, the Collector-General was in-charge of the local administration.

Nagaraka was the chief official of the city administration. Under him were *Sthanikas* who looked after the administration at the division level. Under the *Sthanikas* were the *Gopas* each of whom attended to the affairs of the wards. Thus, Kautilya's *Arthashastra* presents before us a hierarchical and elaborate system of village and city administration.

In the hierarchical administrative organisation presented by the *Arthashastra*, the village represented the base and the king the apex. In between was a hierarchical chain of organisation.

The normal administrative machinery of the government of a State was made up of the following elements, *viz.*, (i) the king, the Chief Executive; (ii) the Council of Ministers; (iii) the head of departments or superintendents; (iv) the subordinate civil services; and (v) officers-in-charge of rural development.

Kautilya's administration consisted of a large number of departments. The division of departments is made according to services required by the people and discharged by the government. These departments were headed by respective *Adhyakshas* or Superintendents working under

a minister. The departments covered almost all aspects of the administrative activities.

Of the various departments mentioned in the *Arthashastra*, "the finance department and the other departments dealing with business and economic activities formed a vital part of the Kautilyan administrative machinery."[6] Kautilya attached highest importance to finance as it was the chief nerve of control and guided all the activities of the government.

The finance department consisted of three officers: the Collector-General of ministerial level known as *Samahrta*; in-charge of revenue collection. The *Sannidhata* (the Treasury-General of ministerial level) was in-charge of treasury and the Superintendent of Accounts in-charge of keeping accounts. He was much below ministerial level.

The Collector-General divided the country into several districts for revenue purposes. The Treasury-General was the custodian of the finances and was responsible for their proper disbursement. Kautilya has laid great emphasis on a system of keeping accurate accounts, without which proper control and administration of the finances was not possible. The annual accounts of every department were regularly submitted to the Accounts Department, examined and audited by competent authority.

Kautilya has classified the income under various heads according to the sources from which they were derived. The important sources were: (i) the capital; (ii) the country parts; (iii) mines; (iv) public works; (v) forests; (vi) pasture lands; (vii) trade.

Similarly, Kautilya has described various heads of expenditure. Main heads were: "sacrifices, worship of ancestors, charity, expenses of the royal household, charges of the civil departments, expenses in connection with the maintenance of foreign missions, the expenses of the army and the army supply services, public works expenditure and expenses for the preservation of forests".[7]

As for the taxation system described in *Arthashastra*, it is in accordance with the concept of welfare. Kautilya has laid down certain guiding principles of taxation in a welfare society; such as the king is not free to levy taxes as he likes, he has to issue a proclamation of his intention to levy certain takes, and if people approved he could levy taxes. Besides, Kautilya provides that the king should levy taxes only on such enterprises as are well established and not new enterprises or industries.

Kautilya advocated a gradual system of taxation. "A king should endeavour to gather the revenue from his subjects in the same way as the fruits of a garden are gathered and often as they become ripe. Just as the gardener would abandon the unripe fruits lest their source should be disturbed, so the State should abandon the unripe sources of the kingdom lest they should cause anger to the people."[8]

"Kautilya's Theory of Taxation was more like the modern theory of prices which are charged by a public authority for specific services rendered and commodities supplied by it."[9] Taxes are paid compulsorily, but prices are paid voluntarily by contracts expressed or implied, with public authorities.

Kautilya's theory of taxation satisfies the canons or the principles of welfare. The tax was certain and not arbitrary. Land revenue was fixed at one-sixth share of the produce; import and export duties were fixed on an *ad valorem* basis. The general rate of import duty on foreign goods was 20% of their value. Kautilya strongly recommended that taxes be not collected in a painful way or mode. Taxes must be levied in proper time and place just as fruits were gathered from a garden as often as they became ripe. Citizens should not be made to feel taxation as burdensome. Kautilya also recommended remission and exemption from taxes in certain cases in accordance with his basic approach of welfare. He emphasised "equity and justice in taxation, and the requirement that the citizens of

the State should contribute towards the support of the government as nearly as possible in proportion to their respective abilities".[10] He also advocated that the taxation policy be so framed which would put an end to exploitation of man by man.

Kautilya advocates that the state should encourage production of such scarce articles as were essential.

Kautilya has given a detailed set up for financial administration, i.e., collection of revenue and its expenditure. He has empowered each superintendent of department to check the performance of each department in relation to its revenue. The authorities suggested for the purpose were *Samaharta* and *Sannidhata*. He has provided for proper audit of accounts to check the occurrence of embezzlement and fraud. He has emphasised the appointment of professionals to the post of heads of departments. For instance, the heads of agriculture and weaving departments should be professionally competent. Kautilya accepted the utility of professionals in administration.[11]

The civil servant is the backbone of administration. The efficacy of the administration depends on the honesty and competence of the civil servant. Kautilya laid stress on the quality of bureaucrats to ensure the efficiency of administration. He particularly emphasised that the qualifications of the persons in the higher echelons of administration should match their position. The higher the responsibilities, the greater the qualities.

The welfare of the people depends on the efficiency and efficacy of the administration which, in turn, depends on the character, ability and competence of the ministers and civil servants. The king's assisting personnel should be well-versed in the science of public administration. Kautilya has not dealt with in detail about the rules and procedure of recruitment, promotion and transfer of civil servants, particularly of the lower personnel, yet the picture of the administrative machinery as outlined in the

Arthashastra is both elaborate and complex. More than the competence, Kautilya stressed the loyalty of the civil servant to the king. The king himself made the higher administrative appointments in consultation with the Prime Minister and the high priest. These appointments were made on the basis of mental, moral and physical qualifications. The king was very selective and carefully examined the socio-economic background of the *Amatyas* and other higher level bureaucrats.

Though there was no clear-cut procedure for recruitment but the qualifications laid down were that the people above allurement and temptation should be appointed as civil servants. Kautilya has advised the king to look to the bodily comforts of his servants by providing emoluments as could motivate them to work with dedication and sincerity. In this context, Kautilya has mentioned their salary, pension and other benefits.

Kautilya laid great emphasis on honesty, integrity and sense of devotion of civil servants both to the state and the citizens. "The qualitative aspect of the personnel is treated in the minutest details".[12]

Besides incentive, Kautilya has also prescribed a series of punishments for offences on the part of government servants. These punishments were : (i) heavy fines; (ii) confiscation of their ill-earned hoards; (iii) transfer from one work to another; and (iv) in some cases, even death penalty.

Superintendents of the departments were very important officers. It was through them that the actual administration was run. *Arthashastra* catalogues a phalanx of superintendents who are lower in importance than the ministerial officers. A dual control is exercised over these superintendents. As far as control of the services of the personnel and collection of revenue are concerned, they were under the Collector-General. But in matter of supply of produced and collected commodities and articles, they are responsible to the Treasure-General (*Sannidhatri*). The *Adhyakshaya Prakarana* mentions in detail the functions

of the superintendents of various departments. Their functions were two-fold: to carry on the administration of the kingdom and to undertake and manage industries and trade on behalf of the State.[13]

In Kautilya's system of governance, espionage was an important institution. The State administration made use of various types of spies for proper functioning of the government machinery. *Samaharta*, who had very important position in the administrative machinery, had power to utilise the services of spies to ensure efficient working of government machinery and staff. No person, including the highest government officer, was immune from detection by spies. *Arthashastra* recommends organising a formidable system of espionage to ensure security against internal enemies, and against attempts to frustrate the welfare policy of the king.[14]

Kautilya was of the view that an effective system of espionage was necessary for keeping the king informed about the affairs of the state. It was also necessary for the purpose of maintaining security, stability and integrity of the kingdom against the dangers of internal dissensions and external aggression. It was also necessary for controlling and curbing corruption in the administration. The king could keep a strict vigil through his spies over the conduct of those whom he assigned the task of running the administration. Inefficient officers were asked to explain their lapses and the corrupt officers were severely punished.

The system and set up of administration, outlined in the *Arthashastra*, is comprehensive and complex. It is based on the principles of *Yogakshema*. Thus Kautilya's state was comprehensive in scope and welfarist in spirit. It was not a police or night watchman but one to take health care and improvement of citizens. Kautilya's state fully left maximum freedom to the regulated life of the citizens but acted in a limited way to secure the happiness of the people. The state not only regulated economic activities but allowed private enterprises for maximum production. But, it checked

private enterprises in many ways to prevent exploitation and monopoly, in the interest of workmen or the consumers. Any violation of the regulation was severely punished. The state likewise regulated craft, labour, agriculture and guilds.

Kautilya has elaborately discussed the system of administration of justice. The king, being the sovereign, was the highest judge in his realm. The Judges were appointed, controlled and removed by the Executive, but were independent in their imparting of justice.

The king's court had both original and appellate jurisdiction. Next in importance to the king's court were the principal courts held in the important centres forming the headquarters of districts or sub-districts. "Besides these courts, each village had its local court, which was composed of the headman and the elders of the village." [15]

Apart from ordinary law courts, there were courts for the removal of the thorns of the State (*Kantaka-Sodhan*). These were administrative courts which dealt with offences which affected the interest of the community and interfered with the proper government of the realm.[16] Justice was administered jointly by those who were well-versed in sacred law and those who held ministerial positions. Kautilya mentions that three members acquainted with the sacred law (*Dharmasthans*) and three ministers of the king (*Amatyas*) were to carry on the administration of justice.

Impartial judicial administration was one of the ideals of Kautilya. The judge, like any other citizen, was punished if he misconducted and did not administer proper justice.

Kautilya mentions various types of penalties for the offenders. These are: fines, imprisonment, mutilation and death penalty.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it may be mentioned that while outlining the details of his administrative system, Kautilya never lost sight of the welfare aspect of the governance. He gave the exact details of public administration dealing with the highly complicated network of relationship within the administrative system. He gave a comprehensive list of instructions regarding the duties, responsibilities and qualifications of ministers and officials. He also gave the details of code of conduct, division of labour, supervision and control, checks and balances, promotions and demotions, pay and remuneration. He emphasized vigilance, supervision and testing the character of administrative personnel so that loyal and competent persons are appointed to responsible administrative positions. He believed that man is by nature corrupt, fickle and unpredictable. The fear of punishment can keep him on the path of honesty and loyalty. Therefore, the role of espionage and fear became important. He relived on the mode of reward and punishment.

His administrative and judicial structure was hierarchical in nature. As for justice, he emphasized the principle of equity and immediacy.

As for law and order, he believed: 'Law was a royal command enforced by sanctions.' Law was backed by moral sanctions. According to him, *Dharma* meant law, justice and was the basis of state. The end of law was to promote the welfare of human beings, both individually and socially.

For Kautilya the management of finances was of crucial importance. Budgeting and taxation forms the core of his financial administration. His planning covers the whole of socio-economic life. He advocated a very wide role of the state in the economic activities.

Kautilya emphasises that the king's interests are not different from those of his subjects. This identification of

interests acts as motivation for the king to work for the welfare of his people. Kautilya assigned the government two duties: (i) maintenance of social order and protection of life and property, and (ii) help people realise their aim of life. The foremost duty of the king was *Praja Palana* (Protection of the subjects) and on this Kautilya built his entire administrative system. His king was not only to act as a ruler but also as a guardian and saviour. The benevolent ideal of the king permeates the entire structure of governance, i.e., to help the helpless and enable the able-bodied normal citizenry to seek avenues of self-employment and welfare in channels other than the state.

Notes and References

1. Cf. Dikshitar, V.R.R., (1932), *The Mauryan Polity*, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, p.141.
2. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 141.
3. Ed. Prasad, D. Ravindra, V.S. Prasad, P. Satyanarayanana, (1989), *Administrative Thinkers*, Sterling Publishers, Delhi, p. 22.
4. Cf. Dikshitar, V.R.R., (1932), *Op. Cit.*, p. 133.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
6. Ed. Parsad, D. Ravindra, (1932), *Op. Cit.*, p. 24.
7. Banerjea, Parmarthanath, (1985), *Public Administration in Ancient India*, Uppal Publishing House, Delhi, p. 181.
8. Dikshitar, V.R.R., (1932), *Op. Cit.*, pp. 147-48.
9. Rao, M.V. Krishna, (1958), *Studies in Kautilya*, Munshi Ram Manoharlal, Delhi, p. 213.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 214.
11. Cf. Kumar, Umesh, (1990), *Kautilya's Thought on Public Administration*, National Book Organisation, Delhi, pp. 142-43.
12. Ed. Prasad, D. Ravindra, (1989), *Op. Cit.*, p. 23.
13. Cf. Rao, M.V. Krishna, (1958), *Op. Cit.*, p. 204.
14. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 210.
15. Banerjea, Parmarthanath, (1985), *Op. Cit.*, p. 146.
16. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 146.

7

RELEVANCE

√The development of welfare state policies, programmes and institutions has been the result of political mobilization, industrial and economic growth, social consciousness implying demand for civil and political rights and the process of public education. Also, the transformation of capitalism into an egalitarian system, compulsions of mass democracy and modernisation helped in the crystallization of the welfare states in the Western societies after the Second World War.

The term 'welfare' can be variously defined as a state or condition of well-being, good fortune, happiness, prosperity of an individual in the community. In order to advance social welfare, most of the modern states have been actively engaged in the building-up of a welfare state structure. These states have become the major suppliers of social security, health care, housing, public transport and

education. Besides this, enhancing human development and the quality of life is the welfarist goal.

"The welfare state is regarded as a form of society characterised by a system of 'democratic government sponsored welfare', offering a guarantee of collective social care of its citizens while maintaining a capitalist system of production".[1] Freedom and equity are considered to be the basis of the modern welfare state. The major focus of welfare state is on social security, education, health and sanitation, housing, eradication of poverty, distributive justice and reduction of unemployment within the parameters of Rule of Law, open society and a free economy.

This shows that the modern welfare state is directly or indirectly engaged in the welfare and improvement of the level of living of the people in a society. The Kautilyan state, too, was concerned with the *Yogakshema* (Promotion of well-being, prosperity, happiness and welfare) of the citizens. Both the citizens and the state were revolving round the common ideal of all-round development of human personality. Unlike the modern welfare state which developed as a response to the Industrial Revolution and the situation after World War II, the Kautilyan concept of *Yogakshema* did not evolve as a consequence of any such revolution or war. The idea of welfare was interwoven in the societal structure itself. The basis of *Yogakshema* was : (i) *Dharma*, (*Varnashramadharma*, *Trivarga*, *Svadharma*, *Satyamevajayate* and Morality); (ii) *Danda* (Power of rule); (iii) Family (as the basic unit of society).

Apparently there are several similarities between the modern welfare state and the Kautilyan theory of *Yogakshema*. There are also significant distinctive features of the Kautilyan concept of welfare state.

SELECTIVITY Vs. UNIVERSALITY

The Kautilyan *Yagakshema* was selective whereas the modern welfare state is universal. Kautilya was of the view

that welfare programmes should be directed towards the deserving citizens (i.e., the aged, the sick, the disabled, the orphans, the homeless and the single parent) only. Kautilya, in spite of the better economic conditions in his times, perceived that the natural resources were to be used only for those who needed them most. Thus, to achieve the goal of maximum welfare of the society, the principle of selectivity was thought to be essential basic necessity of the state. The modern welfare state has also realised the economic implications of universalising welfare causing economic crises and huge economic burden on the government. Instead of working for deserving poor, the modern welfare state is working for the welfare of all its citizens, including the able-bodied, the better-off sections of the society, i.e., non-deserving citizens also. The Kautilyan state had wisely adopted the principle of economic justice.

DUTIES Vs. RIGHTS

Whereas the modern state emphasises rights over duties, Kautilya paid great attention to performing duties, rather than making incessant demands for rights. Kautilya believed that it was the duty of the individual, the society and the state to improve the lot of the citizens and this should get precedence over the demand for more and more rights. People should demand rights within a limit and should not forget their duties. The philosophy of duties contained within itself the concept of rights. *Yogakshema* demanded a higher level of moral consciousness.

SELF Vs. EGO

Kautilya referred to the concept of *Aham Brahamsmi* (I am the Brahma) — a state of supreme well-being and bliss of man. The *Yogakshema* of the citizens has its quintessence in perfection, freedom and self-realisation. The

attainment of this perfection would depend upon material, physical, moral and spiritual welfare. One can interpret this stage as a stage of ambition, selfishness and greed. But this will be a wrong interpretation because 'I am the *Brahma*' means "I am omni-potent, omni-scient, omni-competent— individualism par excellence."[2] But in the modern world ego exists and people are not bothered about the sufferings of others. They are quite self-centred. Thus, modern welfare state revolves round individual welfare whereas Kautilyan *Yogakshema* revolved round the concept of *Vasudhaivakutumbakam* (the whole living world is my family). The highest welfare of man is the attainment of a spiritual status transcending the material one.

SOCIETY Vs. STATE

Kautilya always emphasised the role of society in welfare rather than of the state. The modern welfare state, on the other hand, puts sole responsibility on the state for welfare services as compared to the Kautilyan *Yogakshema*. Kautilya was perhaps closer to MacIver in his view that society and state are not coterminus or coeval. The state is a part of society. The society is sovereign while the state is the servant. The solution of many problems lies within the society. Only during the crisis, when the society finds itself unable to alleviate distress, it should seek the help of the state. According to Kautilya, the state should play the role of a co-ordinator. Unlike Kautilyan *Yogakshema*, the modern welfare state considers that it is solely responsible for the welfare of the society even in normal times. That is why, it is facing several types of crises.

FAMILY AS A UNIT

Kautilya considered family as a basic unit of society. The modern welfare state, on the contrary, believes that the

individual is the basic unit. Kautilya was of the view that a person should seek his welfare in the family. The family was the best security network which could take care of the old, the sick, the disabled in the household which is now-a-days considered to be the responsibility of the modern state. During any period of difficulty or crisis, family could respond with speed and flexibility along with emotional care.

Welfare produced within the family is not sold but provided free. Family care, love and sacrifice cannot be measured in terms of money. Often very large amount of time is spent on unpaid work within the household such as child care. The welfare produced in the household can never be substituted by the state. In fact, there cannot be any substitute for personal affection associated with the family. Moreover, dependence on the state, an impersonal organisation, is bad for the health of the individual as well as the society.

But the modern welfare state emphasised upon the individual which has resulted in penalising marriage, family break-up, destabilised and divided society, lack of morality and distortion of traditional values, norms and conduct of civilized life. Now the modern welfarists have been warned by Charles Murray to turn their attention to the importance of the institution of the family in the society.

SELF-EMPLOYMENT Vs. STATE EMPLOYMENT

Kautilyan *Yogakshema* emphasised self-employment as compared to state employment. According to Kautilya, the state employment to the able-bodied citizens results in an over-burden of the state expenditure. People lack initiative to start work. They become lazy and habitually dependent on the state help. This results in the dependency syndrome which is the major problem of the modern welfare state. Kautilya anticipated this problem and for promoting self-help, he stressed self-employment. His

concept is quite relevant for both developing and developed countries. According to him, the state should generate avenues for self-employment. The state should create conditions and atmosphere for self-employment. For this, the state has to build the confidence in the citizens that they are capable of doing their own work. The freedom of the citizen is commensurate with the area of self-employment — the more scope for self-help, the more free a society is. State employment is likely to lead to higher and higher taxation and corruption.

However, during the 1990s, the welfare state is facing the most serious crisis of diverse forms and proportions. There is no single 'crisis'; it is plural. The burning issue before political scientists is what the welfare state ought to be and what it is in practice? "While there is a general consensus on the basic definition of the welfare state as a social system comprising liberal values, democratic polity and a mixed economy, there are wide-ranging differences on the content of these concepts."[3] It is commonly believed that the welfare state has eradicated 'absolute' poverty, i.e., it has been able to lift every citizen above the poverty line.

The socio-economic and political implications of the welfare state of developing countries need a critical assessment. The present decade is one of dissatisfaction, restlessness and disillusionment as compared to the earlier decades known for intellectual consensus and acceptance about the welfare state. "In fact, the welfare state which was conceived as a problem-solver has turned out to be one of the most serious and challenging problems itself".[4] The critical debate has raised questions about its future.

A developing society, if it has to learn lessons from the negative experiences of welfare state may turn its attention to the Kautilyan doctrines in order to avert the impending dangers. India, for example, should not blindly follow the concept of welfare state but should discern what is useful and what is irrelevant.

What appeared to be politically impossible in the west, has become a necessity because of demographic reasons and the recession that swelled the number of claimants to state benefits. The cost of sustaining the welfare state has spiralled with an increasingly elderly population and a dwindling pool of tax-payers. "Thus the morally desirable welfare state looks fiscally unfeasible. Ruling politicians still dare not call in a demolition squad but they have begun to tinker with the welfare state."[5] They make reassuring noises while resorting to 'reforms'. The research for an 'affordable' welfare system is on.

Critics of welfare state can be divided into two groups: (i) Those who have unquestioned acceptance of the welfare state, but would like it to be reformed in certain vital sectors, and (ii) those who want it to be mended in a radical manner.

The legitimacy of the welfare state is questioned by its opponents. The welfare state is suffering from "apoplexy at centre and anemia at the extremities".[6] Controlled politico-economic power structure, fragmented bureaucracy, little resources and negligence of family responsibilities have created an atmosphere of habitual dependence. This attitude has created a huge number of dependents in case of whom the will to work has become weak. There seems to be wide ideological and political difference on the issue of the continuation of the welfare state. But there is also a universal acceptance of the reality that there are no signs of its withering away. People in several countries of the world are now deriving a large variety of benefits from the welfare state. Some think that it takes care from the cradle to the grave. As a consequence, the welfare state has come to stay. Therefore, they have to live with it.

As we know each welfare state has originated or emerged from its own socio-cultural and historical experiences as well as a system of economy. No unilinear evaluation of the welfare state can be made. Still certain common criteria can be developed to evaluate the extent of

welfare promoted in different countries operating under the welfare state.

Even the governments which are hostile (for example, the British Government of Margaret Thatcher and now John Major) towards the very concept of the welfare state are unable to reverse the trend of increasing expenditure on the welfare services. Beneficiaries, bureaucrats, administrators and distributors of benefits provide solid bedrock for the state welfare.[7]

The claims of the success of the welfare state in reducing inequality, providing social justice, fair opportunities and eradication poverty have been subjected to critical analysis. It is argued that the inequality between the classes (poor, middle and rich) still continues to exist in a welfare state. Maybe, justice and not equality is the credo of the modern welfare state.

Social justice, rights and compulsory taxation seem to be illusory slogans now-a-days which were earlier considered as the basis of welfare state. It is argued that state paternalism dampens initiative of an individual to become self-reliant. "The welfare state as a 'nanny state' ensures cradle to grave security reducing citizens to a permanent status of infants, besides sapping the vitality and weakening the moral fibre of the community at large." [8]

Charles Murray and Herbert Spencer were disappointed to note the absence of any mechanism to review the past legislation of the welfare state.[9] Murray also criticized the crisis of values in western-industrial societies and stressed the distortion of traditional values, norms and conduct of civilized life.

Another crisis is that the expensive administrative structure and the increasing welfare expenditure on the unemployed, the aged, the disabled, the sick, the orphans, the homeless and the single parents are creating more and more demands which are causing high inflation resulting in huge burdens on the state.

According to Hazel Handerson the cause of economic crisis of welfare state is the enthronement of "some of our most unattractive pre-disposition: material acquisitiveness, competition, gluttony, pride, selfishness, short-sightedness and just plain greed".[10]

According to Segalman and Marsland, welfare state is passing through the following crisis: "(i) High unemployability, (ii) high unemployment; (iii) high government deficit; (iv) a huge body of centralised bureaucracy resistant to cutting; (v) an extensive social pathology in the form of low educational achievement; (vi) increased illegitimacy; (vii) criminality and drug addiction; (viii) extensive alienation; (ix) intermittent riotous behaviour; (x) emigration of skilled employees; and (xi) inflation." [11]

Kenneth Minogue criticised the very idea of welfare state as he believed that welfare and state do not fit happily together. Stephen Davies criticised welfare state for its over-burdening cost, complex organisation, ineffectiveness, damaging side-effects, inability to respond to changing demands, and the proneness to undercut by economic change.[12]

The welfare state is also criticised on the basic questions related to both its moral philosophy and administration, such as, What is poverty? Who should remove it? What are the goals of the welfare state? These questions have remained unanswered.

Hermonie Parker gives reasons for the prevailing mess. "The welfare system is so complex that it is incomprehensible, it is uncoordinated, expensive to administer, in a state of deterioration, discriminatory and arbitrary, penalises marriage and subsidises family break-up, destabilises and divides society, undermines the rule of law, and it is not a welfare state but a system of pauperisation".[13]

Welfare state is also criticised for its increasing involvement in social welfare, implying reduction in

the area of individual freedom. Thus, it hampers growth of personality by making a person dependent on the state. This resulted in undermining ambition, initiative, incentive, enterprise and therefore, becoming counter-productive.

Two factors—inflation and wage growth—are impeding economic progress. Economies have reached a stagnation point because of multiple economic crises. "Stagflation, large scale unemployment, recession, decline in resources, cut back in services, governments' inability to manage mixed economy, failure of the conventional techniques of state intervention and a loss of confidence are the major features of the disarray in which most welfare states find themselves."[14]

In the light of the above analysis, if we take the case of India as a welfare state we find that India is not able to achieve a basic minimum level of living for all (40% of population is still below the poverty line). Education for all is a distant goal for India. There are a large number of drop-outs among scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, artisans and the poor. Higher education is only for the select few. There is no provision of security against sickness. Health insurance is a distant dream. Collective bargaining is very limited. Bulk of self-employed in small and medium businesses are exploited by the market. Basic minimum is guaranteed only to workers in the highly organised sector, but they constitute only 10% of the total labour-market. Unemployment insurance has not been introduced as yet. All talk about 'Right to Work' is a myth. Housing for the poor is also a distant dream.

In the current debate on the welfare state, there is a dominant school of thought that pleads for greater privatisation as in the case of India.

Privatisation is suggested as the only way to solve the crisis in the welfare state. An increased reliance on the non-governmental agencies leads to both efficiency and competition. It provides people a direct stake in promoting

economic growth. It is also assumed that privatisation provides more freedom to the individual. Privatisation provides motivation and enthusiasm to articulate, mediate and promote the interest of the citizen. But, privatisation has its limits. "There is no systematic evidence to suggest that the private provision is always more efficient than the public provision. Nor can we prove that shift in ownership always leads to competition, and competition, in return, always leads to efficiency."[15] It is also argued that privatisation is likely to divide the society into the 'winners' and the 'losers' which can also have a destabilising effect on the polity. It is likely to have a devastating effect on society as a whole. Without state regulation, the markets are likely to widen inequalities, dislocation and exploitation.

SUPERIORITY OF KAUTILYAN WELFARE SYSTEM

Kautilya's welfare state can be studied in terms of its relevance or irrelevance to contemporary era. It seems Kautilya's concept of welfare state is more relevant to the problems of under-developed countries with limited resources. The welfare state of Kautilya targeted its expenditures towards the aged, the sick, the weak, the disabled and the poor but did not universalise the benefits. The basic assumption of Kautilya was that the rich, the affluent and the upper classes do have resources to provide for their own welfare and the state need not allocate its scarce funds for the purpose. Instead, the state should concentrate its resources to help the weaker sections. In this way, the Kautilyan state tries to maximise the welfare function with the resource constraints.

The growing expenditures of the modern welfare state in view of the universalisation of the concept of welfare are a realisation of the fact that the state cannot meet increasing welfare expenditure with its failure to raise adequate tax revenues for the purpose. Consequently, the

state faces fiscal crisis and thus uses the technique of deficit budgeting to finance the crisis. This leads to the inflationary spiral which aggravates the crisis. Kautilya, therefore, was a visionary in the sense that he perceived this crisis and restricted welfare only to the needy so that welfare remains within the manageable limits.

Moreover, Kautilya was against developing a 'dependency syndrome' in the society in which the individual continues to make larger and larger demands on the state. Rather he preferred to create a social system in which individual's initiative could be kindled so that the individual or the family learns to solve its problems by self-effort. The modern welfare state is suffering from this dependency psychosis and the vested interests of the individuals prevent the rulers to withdraw even a modicum of benefits granted to the citizens, for fear of a backlash in the polls. It has also helped the vagrant and the affluents to draw benefits from the state. Thus, the modern welfare state even provides benefits to the undeserving and the lazy, whereas Kautilya targeted his whole concept of welfare state to the deserving poor citizens only.

Kautilyan concept of welfare treated family as a basic unit and enjoined upon the family to look after its members in time of difficulty or the crisis. The family was also considered the institution of social security. In that sense, it was the moral responsibility of the family to look after the welfare of the household. In that sense, Kautilya did not put excessive pressure on the state to provide welfare, but wanted to restrain it within the manageable proportions.

The growth of welfare state in Western societies and the convulsions through which it is passing and the various crises that it is facing leads one to believe that the modern welfare state can be salvaged if the philosophy of *Yogakshema* or the Kautilyan concept of welfare state is worked out in a proper perspective.

It is not suggested here that all Kautilya's prescriptions are valid for our age, but surely an in-depth study of

Kautilya's *Arthashastra* as a comprehensive treatise on political, social, economic and administrative dimensions of his concept of *Yogakshema* need to be examined with an open mind. Whether "his well-reasoned solutions to various problems are eternal sources of inspiration and guidance",[16] can be scrutinised with circumspection.

The concept of *Yogakshema* is of particular significance. Its goal is all-round development, material as well as spiritual and this development is of the entire society and not of an individual. Material prosperity is not to be pocketed by a few but there has to be its just and equitable distribution. Material prosperity is not an end in itself but material provisions are essential and it is the duty of the state to ensure this. It may be noted that *Yogakshema* is a forerunner of the contemporary idea of *Ram Rajya* and even *Antodaya* (Welfare of the poorest of the poor).

The basic point is that Indian treatises on polity are full of *Danda* and also of regulations for *Dandahrta*, i.e., the ruler who holds and upholds the law and order. For smooth, efficient and planned functioning of any organisation there is a need for norm-legislation, norm-adherence and norm-enforcement. Norms are not subjective and arbitrary. They have to be objective and trans-personal.

Norms are needed to ensure rights of the individuals and the security of the society. In fact, there is no incompatibility or separation between the two. Nor is there any antagonism between state authority and individual freedom so as to treat state as a necessary or avoidable evil. The state is needed for the welfare of the individual and the society, and, no withering away of the state is visualised.

Another point to be noted here is that 'an authority' is impersonal law but 'in authority' is always a person or a body of persons who execute and ensure law-abidance. 'An authority' is autonomous but 'in authority' is subject to rules and regulations. 'An authority' has intrinsic worth but 'in authority' has instrumental value. A person is 'in authority' for the sake of maintenance of law and order. For

this he may build up institutions and introduce systems. But in all this he has to be 'duty bound' and, therefore, to abide by some rules and regulations. This precisely is the idea conveyed by the term *Rajadharma*. The '*Raja*' has a *Dharma*, i.e. law-abiding status. He must know his *Dharma* and must have a will and power to abide by it.[17]

Dharma has a cosmic sphere of operation. It sustains the entire cosmos and all beings. *Dharma* has at once both constitutive and regulative roles. It constitutes the life-force and the sustaining power. It is also regulative force. According to Kautilya, the entire cosmos is *Dharma*-bound. A ruler or king also is *Dharma*-bound. He cannot be an exception to the all-pervading bounds of *Dharma*. There are various types of *Dharmas* and the statecraft within the bounds of *Dharma* is known as *Rajadharma*. *Rajadharma* is double-edged. It puts desirable restraints on the behaviour of the subjects so as to enable them to realise their *Purusharthas* but at the same time it also makes the person 'in authority' subject to restraints.

In the Indian tradition 'in authority' is not to enjoy power and privileges, but to discharge duties and responsibilities. It cannot be immune to accountability and oblivious of its responsibilities. The ultimate accountability and responsibility of 'a person in authority' is in respect of the universal good, the *Svasti*, the *Yogakshema*. Kautilya discovered the essential unity of the entire universe, the human beings, all living creatures and the natural surrounding. He emphasised the non-dual character of their inter-relationship. The general welfare of the humankind for him did not exclude the well-being of the entire cosmos. He advocated an integrated approach to progress aimed at the harmonious development of the various facets of reality. The concept of *Mangala* is the notion of universal good, *Sarva mangala*. The divine order is for universal good. The divine force, represented as the female power of the lord works for universal good. This is the invocation to be recited daily so as to remind us every day to work for the

universal good. Thus the task of the state is to help in the realisation of this *Mangala* or *Kalyana.*

CONCLUSION

The welfarism propounded in the Kautilyan thought is not materialistic welfarism but holistic welfarism in which the welfare not only of the citizens of the state but of the whole humanity and the entire cosmos is taken into consideration. It is a spiritualistic welfarism which not only covers material welfare but also transcends it.

According to R.P. Kangle, "The fact that the state is to concern itself with the welfare of the subjects might lead one to suppose that we have here something like the idea of a 'welfare state'. This may seem to be supported by the reference to 'those who have necessarily to be maintained' by the state and to the duty of the state to maintain minors, aged persons and those in distress when these have no one to look after them",[18] It can also be justly maintained that the Kautilyan state is neither police state nor a merely tax-gathering state but it is a welfare state in a more comprehensive form.

It fulfils the basic criteria of a modern liberal welfare state with its totalitarian implications shorn off. To help the helpless is the traditional Kautilyan notion of a welfare state and in that sense there is its relevance for modern times.

According to M.M. Sankhdher, "Indian planners, economists and policy-makers who have worked more than four decades on the Nehruvian model can, at least for experimenting, search the Kautilyan model of a welfare state. It would be easier for India to benefit from its past rich contribution to political and social engineering. Even the western societies, in order to get out of the prevailing crises, may like to conform to the vital principles of family integration, selective social security, preference to voluntary

and private bodies over state-sponsored welfare and provision of justice with liberty."[19]

Yogakshema has all the vital ingredients of a modern welfare state and Kautilya's *Arthashastra* can be re-examined from the angle of global human concerns for a better society — harmonious, stable and prosperous blended with moral and spiritual awareness.

What is usefully common between western democracies and India is that we both detest regimentation, indoctrination, thought control, authoritarianism and totalitarianism and subscribe to the canons of liberty as the basic foundation of a welfare state structure. The policy of the state should, therefore, conform to whether welfare provisions help a person towards self-help and growth of his unique personality. Cradle-to-grave model of welfare state is completely unsuited to India's ethos. A limited welfare state, operating under social control, is eminently suited for India and Kautilya's welfare state is such a type.

Notes and References

1. Gupta, Asha, (1994), *Changing Perspective of the Welfare State — The Issue of Privatisation*, Pragati Publications, Delhi, p. 3.
2. Sankhdher, M.M., (1987), Kautilya — Philosopher of Modern Welfare State, *Organiser*, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 36, January 18, pp. 19-21
3. Sankhdher, M.M., Crisis in Welfare State: Warning Signals for Developing Societies, *Mimeo*, April 13, 1994, p. 1.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
5. Sharma, L.K., (1994), No Room for the Wretched—Welfare State is in Peril, *The Sunday Times of India*, January 9, p. 6.
6. Cf. Habermass J., (1994), Legitimation Crisis, See M.M. Sankhdher, *Op. Cit.*, p. 3.
7. Cf. Sankhdher, M.M., (1994), *Op. Cit.*, pp. 4-5.

8. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
9. Cf. Sankhdher, M.M., (1975), *The Concept of Welfare State—Genesis and Development*, Publication Division, University of Delhi, Delhi and Murray, Charles, (1988), *In Pursuit of Happiness and Good Governance*, Simon and Schuster, New York.
10. Handerson, Hazel, (1978), *Creating Alternative Futures*, quoted in Shankhdher, M.M., *Op. Cit.*, p. 12.
11. Sankhdher, M.M., (1994), *Op. Cit.*, p. 13.
12. Cf. Davies, Stephen, (1986), *Beveridge Revisited*, Britain.
13. Parker, Hermonie, (1984), *Research Report*, Sydney, Australia.
14. Mishra, Ramesh, (1984), *The Welfare State in Crisis*, Harnester Press, Brington.
15. Gupta, Asha, (1994), *Op. Cit.*, p. 130.
16. Sihag, Balbir S., (1994), Kautilya's Vision, *Hindustan Times* (Sunday).
17. Bhatt, S.R., Welfarism and Classical Indian Thought, *Mimeo*, April 13, 1993.
18. Kangle, R.P., (1965), *The Kautilya Arthashastra*, Part III, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, p. 119.
19. As stated by Prof. M.M. Sankhdher in a discussion on the subject held on 12th March, 1994.

Appendix

Kautilya have used the word *Yogakshema* (*Yoga* is the acquisition of things and *ksema* is their secure possession; the two together convey the idea of security and well-being or prosperity) in the following *Adhikaranas* in the *Arthashastra*—

अधिकरण-1, प्रकरण-1, अध्याय-3, श्लोक-2

आन्वीक्षकीत्रयीवार्तानां *योगक्षेम*साधनो दण्डः । तस्य नीतिर्दण्डनीतिः । अलब्धलाभार्था; लब्धपरिरक्षणी; रक्षितविवर्धनी; वृद्धस्य तीर्थेषु प्रतिपादनी च ।

(गैरोला वाचस्पति, 1962 *कौटिलीय-अर्थशास्त्रम*, चौखम्बा विद्याभवन, वाराणसी, पृष्ठ-15)

The means of ensuring the pursuit of philosophy, the three *Vedas* and economics is the Rod (wielded by the king); its administration constitutes the science of politics, having for its purpose the acquisition of (things) not possessed, the preservation of (things) possessed, the augmentation of (things) preserved and the bestowal of (things) augmented on an worthy recipient. On it is dependent the ordarly maintenance of worldly life.

(Kangle, R.P., 1988, *The Kautiliya Arthasastra*, Part-II, Motilal Banarsi Dass, p. 9).

अधिकरण-1, प्रकरण-2, अध्याय-4, श्लोक-1

तस्माद्दण्डमूलास्तिस्त्रो विद्याः । विनयमूलो दण्डः प्राणभृतां *योगक्षेमावहः* ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-18)

Therefore, the three sciences have their root in the (just

administration of) the Rod. (Administration of) the Rod, (when) rooted in self-discipline, brings security and well-being to living beings.

Ibid., p. 10

अधिकरण-1, प्रकरण-3, अध्याय-6, श्लोक-1

तस्मादरिषड्वर्गत्यागेनेन्द्रियजयं कुर्वीत । वृद्धसंयोगेन प्रज्ञां, चारेण चक्षुउत्थानेन *योगक्षेम*साधनः, कार्यानुशासनेन स्वधर्मस्थापनं, विनयं विद्योपदेशेन, लोकप्रियत्वमर्थसंयोगेन, हितेन वृत्तिम् ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-22)

Therefore, by casting out the group of six enemies he should acquire control over the senses, cultivate his intellect by association with elders, keep a watchful eye by means of spies, bring about security and well-being by (energetic) activity, maintain the observance of their special duties (by the subjects) by carrying out (his own) duties, acquire discipline by (receiving) instruction in the sciences, attain popularity by association with what is of material advantage and maintain (proper) behaviour by (doing) what is beneficial.

Ibid., p-13

अधिकरण-1, प्रकरण-8, अध्याय-12, श्लोक-3

तत्र यऽनुप्रशंसेयुः, तानितरस्तं च प्रतिषेधयेत्-मात्स्यन्यायाभिभूताः प्रजामनुं वैवस्वतं राजान चक्रिरे । धान्यषड्भागं पण्यदशभागं हिरण्यं चास्य भागधेयं प्रकल्पयामासुः । तेन भृता राजानः प्रजानां *योगक्षेम*वहाः । तेषां किल्विषं दण्डकरा हरन्ति, *योगक्षेम*वहाश्च प्रजानाम् । तस्मादुच्छषड्भागमारण्यका अपि निवपन्ति—तस्यैतद् भागधेयं योऽस्मान् गोपायतीति । इन्द्रयमस्थानमेतद् राजानः प्रत्यक्षहेडप्रसादाः । तानवमन्यमानं दैवोऽपि दण्डः स्पृशति । तस्माद् राजानो नावमन्तव्याः इति क्षुद्रकान् प्रतिषेधयेत् ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-44-45)

The other should contradict him as well as those who may commend his views there. (He should say,) 'People, overwhelmed by the law of the fishes, made Manu, the son of Vivasvat, their king. And they assigned one-sixth of the

grains, one-tenth of the commodities and money as his share. Maintained by that, kings bring about the well-being and security of the subjects. Those who do not pay fines and taxes take on themselves the sins of those (kings) and (kings) who do not bring about well-being and security (take on themselves the sins) of the subjects. Therefore, even forest-dwellers offer a sixth part of their gleaned grains, saying: "This is the share for him who protects us." This is the office of *Indra* and *Yama*, viz., (that of) the kings, whose wrath and favour are visibly manifest. Even divine punishment strikes those who slight them. Therefore, kings must not be slighted.' Thus he should restrain the common people. And they should also find out rumours (spreading among the subjects).

Ibid., pp. 28-29

अधिकरण-1, **प्रकरण**-10, **अध्याय**-14, **श्लोक**-3

मन्त्रभेदो ह्य*योगक्षेम*करो राज्ञस्तदायुक्तपुरुषाणां च। तस्माद् गुह्यमेको मन्त्रयेतेति भारद्वाजः । मन्त्रिणामपि हि मन्त्रिणो भवन्ति । तेषामप्यन्ये । सैषा मन्त्रिपरम्परा मन्त्रं भिनत्ति ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-53)

'The divulgence of secret counsel is fatal to the security and well-being of the king and the officers appointed by him. Therefore, he should deliberate alone over a confidential matter,' says Bharadvaja. 'For, even councillors have (other) councillors, and these have others still. Thus this series of councillors leads to the divulgence of secret counsel.

Ibid., p. 33

अधिकरण-3, **प्रकरण**-67, **अध्याय**-11, **श्लोक**-3

राजन्य*योगक्षेम*वहे तु धनिकधारणिकयोश्चरित्रमवेक्षेत ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-366)

If, however, the king is unable to ensure protection, the (judge) should take into consideration to usual practice among creditors and debtors.

Ibid., p. 226

अधिकरण-6, **प्रकरण**-97, **अध्याय**-2, **श्लोक**-1

शमव्यायामौ *योगक्षेम*योर्योनिः ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-540)

Peace and activity constitute the source of acquisition and security.

Ibid., p. 317

अधिकरण-6, **प्रकरण**-97, **अध्याय**-2, **श्लोक**-1

दृष्टकारितं मानुषम्। तस्मिन् *योगक्षेम*निष्पत्तिर्नयः । विपत्तिरपनयः । तच्चिन्त्यम्। अचिन्त्यं दैवमिति ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-541)

(Acts) of human agency are good policy and bad policy; of divine agency good fortune and misfortune. For, it is acts of human and divine agency that make the world go. That caused by an unseen agency is the divine (act). In that, the attainment of the desired fruit is good fortune; of undesired (fruit), misfortune. That caused by a seen agency is the human (act). In that, the coming into being of well-being is good policy; (its) ruin, bad policy. That can be thought about; the divine is incalculable.

Ibid., p. 317

अधिकरण-7, **प्रकरण**-108-110, **अध्याय**-5, **श्लोक**-1

अवक्षेपेण हि सतामसतां प्रग्रहेण च। अभूतानां च हिसानामधर्म्याणां प्रवर्तनैः ।।
उचितानां चरित्राणां घर्मिष्ठानां निवर्तनैः । अधर्मस्य प्रसंगेन धर्मस्यावग्रहेण च ।।
अकार्याणां च करणैः कार्याणां च प्रणाशनैः । अप्रदानैश्चः देयानामदेयानां च साधनैः ।।
अदण्डनैश्च दण्डयानामदण्डयानां चण्डदण्डनैः । अग्राहयाणामुपग्राहैर्ग्राह्याणां चानभिग्रहै : ।
अनर्थ्यानां च करणैरर्थ्यानां च विघातनैः । अरक्षणश्चै चौरेभ्यः स्वयं च परिमोषणैः ।।
पातैः पुरुषकारणां कर्मणां गुणदूषणेः । उपघातैः प्रधानानां मान्यानां चावमाननैः ।।
विरोधनैश्च वृद्धानां वैषम्येणानृतेन च । कृतस्याप्रतिकारेण स्थितस्याकरणेन च ।।
राज्ञः प्रमादालस्याभ्यां *योगक्षेम*वधेन च । प्रकृतीनां क्षयो लोभो वैराग्यं चोपजायते ।।
क्षीणाः प्रकृतयो लोभं लुब्धा यान्ति विरागताम् । विरक्ता यान्त्यमित्रं वा भर्तारं ध्नन्ति वा स्वयम् ।।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-576-577)

For, by discarding the good and favouring the wicked, and by starting unrighteous injuries not current before, by discontinuing customary practices that are righteous, by indulgence in impiety and suppression of piety, and by doing acts that ought not to be done and by ruining rightful acts, and by not giving what ought to be given and securing what ought not to be given (to him), and by not punishing those deserving to be punished and punishing those not deserving to be punished, by seizing those who ought not to be seized and not arresting those who ought to be siezed, and by doing harmful things and destroying beneficial things, and by failing to protect from thieves and by robbing (thing) himself, by ruining human exertions, by spoiling the excellence of works done, by doing harm to principal men and by dishonouring those worthy of honour, and by opposing the elders, by partiality and falsehood, by not requiting what is done and by not carrying out what is settled, through the negligence and indolence of the king and because of the destruction of well-being—(through these causes) decline, greed and disaffection are produced among the subjects. Subjects, when impoverished, become greedy; when greedy they become disaffected; when disaffected they either go over to the enemy or themselves kill the master.

Ibid., p. 335

अधिकरण-7, प्रकरण-116, अध्याय-10, श्लोक-2

चलामित्राद्भूमिलाभे शक्यसामन्ततो विशेषः । दुर्बलसामन्ता हि क्षिप्राप्यायन*योगक्षेमा* भवति । विपरीता बलवत्सामन्ता कोशदण्डावच्छेदनी च भूमिर्भवति ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-612)

In case of acquisition of land from a moving enemy, (there is) special advantage from a weak neighbour. For, (land) with a weak neighbour has its well-being and security quickly augmented. Land with a strong neighbour is the opposite of this and becomes ruinous to the treasury and the army.

Ibid., p. 353

अधिकरण-7, प्रकरण-118, अध्याय-14, श्लोक-4

प्रभावहीनः प्रकृति*योगक्षेम*सिद्धौ यतेत । जनपदः सर्वकर्मणां योनिः, ततः प्रभावः ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-641)

If weak in might, he should endeavour to secure the welfare of his subjects. The countryside is the source of all undertakings; from them comes might.

Ibid., p. 368

अधिकरण-7, प्रकरण-119-120, अध्याय-15, श्लोक-2

'पार्ष्णिग्राहमासारं मध्यममुदासीनं वा प्रतिपादयिष्यामि । सामन्ताटविकतत्कुलीनावरुद्धानामन्यतमेनास्य राज्यं हारयिष्यामि घातयिष्यामि वा । कृत्यपक्षोपग्रहेण वास्य दुर्गे राष्ट्रे स्कन्धावारे वा कोपं समुत्थापयिष्यामि । शस्त्राग्निरसप्रणिधानैरोपनिषदिकैर्वा यथेष्टमासन्नं हनिष्यामि । स्वयमधिष्ठितेन वा योगप्रणिधानेन क्षयव्ययमेनमुपनेष्यामि । क्षयव्ययप्रवासोपतप्ते वास्य मित्रवर्गे सैन्यं वा क्रमेणोपजापं प्राप्स्यामि । यीवधासारप्रसारवधेन वास्य स्कन्धावारावग्रहं करिष्यामि । दण्डोपनयेन वास्य रन्ध्रमत्थाप्य सर्वसन्दोहेन प्रहरिष्यामि । प्रतिहतोत्साहेन वा यथेष्टं सन्धिमवाप्स्यामि । मयि प्रतिबन्धस्य सर्वतः कोपाः समुत्थास्यन्ति । निरासारं वास्य मूलं मित्राटवीदण्डैरुद्घातयिष्यामि । महतो वा देशस्य *योगक्षेम*मिहस्थः पालयिष्यामि । स्वविक्षिप्तं मित्रविक्षिप्तं वामे सैन्यमिहस्थस्यैकस्थमविषह्यं भविष्यति । निम्नखातरात्रियुद्धविशारदंवामे सैन्यं पथ्याबाधमुक्तमासन्ने कर्मणि करिष्यति । विरुद्धदेशकालमिहागतो वा स्वयमेव क्षयव्ययाभ्यां न भविष्यति । महाक्षयव्ययाभिगम्योऽयं देशो दुर्गाटव्यपसारबाहुल्यात्, परेषां व्याधिप्रायः सैन्यव्यायामानामलब्धभौमश्च, तमापद्गतः प्रवेक्ष्यति । प्रविष्टो वा न निर्गमिष्यति' इति ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ-646-648)

He should resort to that (fort) for these reasons: 'I shall win over the enemy in the rear or his ally or the middle king or the natural king; or, I shall cause his kingdom to be seized or destroyed by one of these, viz., his neighbouring king, a forest chief, a pretender from his family and a prince in disfavour, or, by supporting the party of likely seceders, I shall raise a revolt in his fort, country or camp; or, I shall kill him as I please, when he comes near, by the use of weapons, fire or poison or by occult means; or, I shall put him to losses and expenses

on account of secret practices employed by myself; or, I shall succeed in gradually instigating (against him) the group of his allies or his army, when they are severely afflicted by losses, expenses and long marches; or, by destroying his supplies, reserves and foraging parties, I shall bring about the subjugation of his encamped army; or by taking our troops, I shall create a weak point in him and strike with all troops mobilised; or, I shall secure a treaty with him as desired when his energy is damped; or, while he is engaged in a struggle with me, insurrections will rise all round him; or, I shall cause his base, denuded of reserves, to be devastated by my ally's troops or forest troops; or, staying in this fort, I shall protect the welfare of a vast territory; or, if I stay here, my own dispersed troops and those of my ally will collect in one place and be irresistible; or, my army skilled in fighting in water, in trenches or at night, being freed of the dangers of (marches on the) roads, will carry out operations when the (enemy) is near; or, coming here on a terrain and in a season adverse to him, he will himself cease to be because of losses and expenses, (as) this region can be approached only with heavy losses and expenses because of the abundance of forts and forests as places of refuge, is full of sickness for foreigners and without a suitable terrain for the operation of their troops, (and hence) he will enter it (only) when in trouble, and will not get out of it if he enters.'

Ibid., pp. 370-71

अधिकरण-8, प्रकरण-127, अध्याय-1, श्लोक-2

नेतिकौटिल्यः । अमात्यमूलाः सर्वारम्भाः । जनपदस्य कर्मसिद्धयः स्वतः परतश्च योगक्षेमसाधनं व्यसनप्रतीकारः शून्यनिवेशोपचयौ दण्डकरानुग्रहश्चेति ।

(*वही*, पृष्ठ 681-682)

'No', says Kautilya. All undertakings have their origin in the ministers, (viz.), successful execution of works in the country, bringing about its well-being and security from one's own and from the enemy's people, taking counter-measures against calamities, settlement of new lands and

their development, and (bringing in) the benefit of fines and taxes.

Ibid., p. 387

अधिकरण-8, **प्रकरण**-128, **अध्याय**-2, **श्लोक**-1

नेति कौटिल्यः । पितापुत्रयोर्भ्रात्रोर्वा द्वैराज्यं तुल्ययोगक्षेमसमात्यावग्रहं वर्तयेतेति । वैराज्ये तु जीवतः परस्याच्छिद्य 'नैतन्मम' इति मन्यमानः कर्शयत्यपचाहयति, पण्यं वा करोति, विरक्तं वा परित्यज्यापगच्छतीति ।

(वही, पृष्ठ-689)

'No', says Kautilya. Rule by two, (e.g.), by father and son or by two brothers, continues to exist, with well-being and security equally shared and with ministers held in check. Rule without the (legitimate) king, on the other hand, snatching what belongs to another still living, and thinking. 'This does not belong to me,' impoverishes it, carries it off or sells it or, if (still) disaffected, leaves it and goes away.

Ibid., p. 391

अधिकरण-8, **प्रकरण**-130-132, **अध्याय**-4, **श्लोक**-3

क्षुद्रकमुख्यक्षययोः क्षुद्रकक्षयः कर्मणाम*योगक्षेमं* करोति, मुख्यक्षयः कर्मानुष्ठानोपरोधधर्मा इत्याचार्याः ।

(वही, पृष्ठ-703)

'Of the loss of common men and that of chiefs, the loss of common men brings about insecurity of undertakings, the loss of cheifs is characterised by a hindrance to the carrying out of works', say the teachers.

Ibid., p. 397

अधिकरण-13, **प्रकरण**-171, **अध्याय**-1, **श्लोक**-2

परस्य मुख्यान्मित्रत्वेनापदिशन्तो दूतव्यञ्जनाः स्वामिसत्कारं ब्रूयुः । स्वपक्षबलाधानं परपक्षप्रतिघातं च तुल्य*योगक्षेम*ममात्यानामायुधीयानां च कथयेयुः । येषु व्यसनाभ्युदयावेक्षणमपत्यपूजनं प्रयुञ्जीत ।

(वही, पृष्ठ-865)

Agents working as envoys, speaking to the chiefs of the

enemy out of friendship, should tell them of the king's high regard for them, of the strengthening of his own party and the deterioration of the enemy's party. They should tell ministers and soldiers of the same well-being and security (as before). He should show consideration for them in calamities and on festive occasions, and honour their children.

Ibid., p. 475

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aggarwal, V.S., *India as Known to Panini*, Prithvi Prakashan, Varanasi, 1963.

Aiyanger, K.V. Rangaswami, *Aspects of Ancient Indian Economic Thought*, Benares, 1934.

———, *Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity*, Madras University, Madras, 1935.

Aiyer, S.P., (ed.), *Perspective on the Welfare State*, Manaktalas, Bombay, 1966.

Altekar, A.S., *State and Government in Ancient India*, Motilal Banarasidas, Varanasi, 1949.

Asirvatham, Eddy, *Political Theory*, S. Chand & Co., Delhi, 1988.

Bandopadhyaya, N.C., *Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories*, R. Cambray & Co., Calcutta, 1927.

———, *Kautilya*, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1927.

Banerjea, P.N., *Public Administration in Ancient India*, Uppal Publishing House, Delhi, 1985.

Basham, A.L., *The Wonder That was India*, Orient Longman, Bombay, 1963.

———, *The Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1966.

Basham, A. L., *The Wonder that Was India*, London, 1954.
Beni Prasad, *The State in Ancient India*, Central Book Depot, Allahabad, 1928.
———, *Theory of Government in Ancient India*, Central Book Depot, Allahabad, 1968.
Benton, William, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Welfare State, Vol. 23, London, 1971.
Bhandarkar, D.R., *Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity*, Benares Hindu University, Varanasi, 1929.
Bokare, M.G., *Hindu Economics*, Janki Prakashan, Delhi, 1993.
Bruce, Maurice, *The Coming of the Welfare State*, Baisford, London, 1961.
Carter, Charles, Wilson Thomas, *Discussing the Welfare State*, Policy Studies Institute, London, 1980.
Chakravarti, T., *Dharma in the Mahabharata*, Calcutta, Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1969.
Choudhary, Radha Krishna, *Kautilya's Political Ideas and Institution*, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1971.
———, *Economic History of Ancient India*, Janki Prakashan, Delhi, 1982.
Cole, Margaret, *Social Welfare*, London, 1953.
Dahl, Robert, *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1956.
Dikshitar, V.R. Ramachandra, *The Mauryan Polity*, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, 1932.
———, *Hindu Administrative Institutions*, Madras University, Madras, 1929.
Drekmeir, Charles, *Kingship and Community in Early India*, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1962.
Dutt, B.N., *Studies in Indian Social Polity*, Nababharata Publications, Calcutta, 1975.
Dutt, M.N., *Mahabharata*, Primal Publication, Delhi, 1988.
Dutt, Ruddar, K.P.M. Sundharam, *Indian Economy*, S. Chand & Co. Ltd., Delhi, 1993.

Duverger, Mourice, *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*, J. Wiley, New York, 1959.

Ghoshal, U.N., *History of Indian Political Ideas*, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1959.

———, *Contributions to the History of the Hindu Revenue System*, Calcutta University, Calcutta, 1929.

———, *History of Hindu Political Theories*, Oxford University Press, Calcutta, 1923.

Girvetz, Harry K., *The Welfare State*, International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 16, Macmillan and Free Press, London, 1968.

Gopal, M.H., *Mauryan Public Finance*, London, 1935.

Gopalan, S., *Hindu Social Philosophy*, Wiley Eastern Ltd., New Delhi, 1979.

Goyal, S.R., *Kautilya and Megasthenes*, Kusumanjali Prakashan, Meerut, 1985.

Grand, J. Le, (ed.), *Privatisation and the Welfare State*, Allen University, London, 1984.

Gunguly, N.C., *Indian Political Philosophy*, Kamala Book Depot, Calcutta, 1939.

Gunnar, Heckscher, *The Welfare State and Beyond*, Minneapolis, U.S.A.

Gupta, Asha, *Changing Perspective of the Welfare State— The Issue of Privatisation*, Pragati Publications, Delhi, 1994.

Hobman, D.L., *The Welfare State*, John Murray, London, 1953.

Janowitz, Morris, *Social Control of the Welfare State*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1976.

Jauhari, Manorama, *Ethics and Politics in Ancient India*, Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Varanasi, 1968.

Jayaswal, K.P., *Hindu Polity*, Butterworth & Co., Calcutta, 1924.

Jha, D.N., *Economy and Society in Early India — Issues and Paradigms*, Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi, 1993.

Johan P. Olsen, *Democracy : Political Institutions in a Welfare State*, Bergsen, 1993.

Kane, P.V., *A History of Dharmasastras*, Vols. 1-5, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1930-77.

Kangle, R.P., *The Kautilya Arthasastra*, Parts I-III, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, 1986.

Kent, T.W., *The Welfare State*, London, 1950.

Keynes, J.M., *Full Employment in a Free Society*.

Kohli, Ritu, *Political Ideas of M.S. Golwalkar*, Deep & Deep Publications, Delhi, 1993.

Kosambi, D.D., *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1956.

Kumar, Umesh, *Kautilya's Thought on Public Administration*, National Book Organisation, Delhi, 1990.

Kumari, S., *Role of State in Ancient Indian Economy*, Ramanand Vidya Bhavan, Delhi, 1986.

Law, N.N., *Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity*, Oxford University Press, London, 1921.

———, *Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity*, Oxford, 1914.

Mabbett, I.W., *Truth, Myth and Politics in Ancient India*, Publication Division, Delhi, 1972.

Macaulay, *Essays on Machiavelli.*

Mark, R.L., *The Welfare State*, London, 1950.

Marx, Herbert L., (ed.), The Welfare State, London, 1950.

Maurice, Bruce, *The Coming of the Welfare State*, Batsford, London, 1961.

Max Mueller, *India: What it Can Teach Us*, Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi, 1961.

Mazumdar, R.C., *Corporate Life In Ancient India*, Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyaya and Co., Calcutta, 1969.

Mees, G.T., *Dharma and Society*, Luzac and Co., London, 1953.

Mehta, Usha and Usha Thakkar, *Kautilya and His Arthasastra*, S. Chand &. Co., New Delhi, 1980.

Mishra, Ramesh, *The Welfare State In Crisis*, Harnester Press, Brington, 1984.

Mookerji, Radha Kumud, *Chandra Gupta Maurya and His Times*, Rajkamal Publication, Bombay, 1952.

Mukherjee, K.P., *Ancient Political Experiences*, M.D. Gunasena and Co., Colombo, 1961.

Murray, Charles, *In Pursuit of Happiness and Good Governance*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1988.

Myrdal, Gunnar, *Beyond the Welfare State*, Gerald Duckwoth and Co. Ltd., London, 1960.

Nagar, Vandana, *Kingship in the Sukraniti*, Pushpa Prakashan, Delhi.

Nigam, S.S., *Economic Organisation in Ancient India*, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1975.

Parmar, Aradhana, *Techniques of Statecraft — A Study of Kautilya's Arthsastra*, Atma Ram and Sons, Delhi, 1987.

Pigou, A.C., *The Economics of Welfare*, Macmillan, 4th edn., London, 1932.

Pran Nath, *A Study in the Economic Conditions of Ancient India*, London, 1929.

Prasad, D. Ravindra, V.S. Prasad, P. Satyanarayana (eds.), *Administrative Thinkers*, Sterling Publishers, Delhi, 1989.

Radhakrishnan, S., *Religion and Society*, Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1947.

———, *The Bhagavad Gita*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1948.

Raja, C.K., *Some Aspects of Education in Ancient India*, Vasanta Press, Madras, 1950.

Ramaswamy, T.N., *Essentials of Indian Statecraft*, Asia Publishing House, India, 1962.

Roa, M.V. Krishna, *Studies in Kautilya*, Oriental Booksellers and Publishers, Delhi, 1958.

Roberts, David, *Victorian Origins of the Welfare State*, Yale, 1960.

Saletore, B.A., *Ancient Indian Political Thought and Institutions*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1983.

Sankhdher, M.M., *Reflection on Indian Politics*, Kumar Brothers, Delhi, 1973.

———, M.M., *The Concept of Welfare State : Genesis and Development*, Publication Division, University of Delhi, Delhi, 1975.

——— , *The Welfare State*, Deep & Deep Publications, Delhi, 1985.

Sarkar, B.K., *The Political Institutions and Theories of Hindus, Leipzig*, Varlana Ven Market and Petters, 1922.

Sastri, K.A.N., (ed.), *Age of Nandas and Mauryas*, Motilal Banarasidas, Varanasi, 1952.

Sen, A.K., *Studies in Ancient Indian Political Thought*, Chatterjee and Co., Calcutta, 1929.

Sen, B.C., *Economics in Kautilya*, Sanskrit College, Calcutta, 1967,

Sengupta, N.C., *Sources of Law and Society in Ancient India*, Sengupta Trust, Calcutta, 1913.

Shamasastri, R,, *Kautilya's Arthasastra*, Sri Raghuvir Printing Press, 1956.

———, R., *The Arthasastra of Kautilya*, translated into English, Bangalore, 1915, 4th ed., 1960.

Sharan, P., *Ancient Indian Political Thought and Institutions*, Meenakshi Prakashan, Meerut, 1978.

Sharma, B.L., *Economic Ideas in Ancient India Before Kautilya*, Ramanand Vidya Bhavan, Delhi, 1987.

Sharma, R.S., *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1983.

——— , *Perspectives in Social and Economic History of India*, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1983.

Singh, Nagendra, *Juristic Concepts of Ancient India Polity*, Vision Books, New Delhi, 1980.

Sinha, B.P., *Readings in Kautilya's Arthasastra*, Agam Prakashan, Delhi, 1976.

Sinha, H.N., *Sovereignty in Ancient Indian Polity*, Luzac and Co., London, 1938.

Sinha, H.N., *The Development of Indian Polity*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1963.

Smith, D.E., *India as a Secular State*, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1963.

Spellman, J.W., *Political Theory of Ancient India*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1964.

Subramaniam, V.K., *Maxims of Chanakya : The Crystallised Wisdom of the Indian Machiavelli*, Abhinav Publishers, New Delhi, 1980.

Subramaniam, Malathi, *Management of Public Administration*, Deputy Publication, Delhi, 1987.

Thapar, R., *Ashoka and the Decline of the Mauryas*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1963.

Thapar, Romila, *History of India*, Vol. I, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1966.

Titmuss, R.M., *Essays on the Welfare State*, Allen and Unwin, London, 1958.

Trautmann, R. Thomas, *Kautilya and the Arthasastra*, Netherlands, 1971.

Vagasin, A.A., A.M. Samozvantsev, *Society, State and Law in Ancient India*, Sterling Publishers, Delhi.

Verma, V.P., *Hindu Political Thought and its Metaphysical Foundations*, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, 1959.

Williams, Gertrude, *The Coming of the Welfare State*, Jarrold & Sons, Norwich, 1967.

Articles

Arora, Dolly, Addressing Welfare in a Developing Country Context — The Case of India, Paper prepared for submission to the *International Political Science Association Workshop* on 'What Developing Societies Can Learn from the Welfare State' under the Chairmanship of Prof. M.M. Sankhdher, Department of Political Science, University of Delhi, India on April 13, 1993, pp. 1-25.

Bhardvaja, Brahma, Dharma: Philosophy of Social Organisation, *SAR Economist*, November 1993, pp. 25-27.

Bhatt, S.R., Welfarism and Classical Indian Thought, *International Political Science Association Workshop* on April 13, 1993, pp. 1-12.

Conservative Political Centre, The Future of the Welfare State, No. 178, 1992.

Denning, Alfred, Lecture, The Christian Approach to the Welfare State, *Shaftesbury Society*, London, 1953.

Dewan, Yashpal; Theories About the Origin of State, *School of Correspondence Courses & Continuing Education*, 1990, pp. 1-10.

Dikshitar, V.R. Ramachandra, Kautilya and Machiavelli, *IHQ*, III, 1927, pp. 176-80.

Ghoshal, U.N., The Authority of the King In Kautilya's Political Thought, *IHQ*, XXVIII, 1952, pp. 307-11 and *IHQ*, XXIX, 1958, pp. 280-92.

Hazra, R.C., Kautilya Studies, *Our Heritage*, X, 1, Calcutta, 1962.

Jayaswal, K.P., The Arthasastra Explains, *IA*, 74, 1918, pp. 50-56.

Johnston, E.H., Two Studies in the Arthasastra of Kautilya, *JRAS*, 1929, pp. 77-102.

Kane, P.V., The Arthasastra of Kautilya, *ABORI*, VII, 1926, pp. 85-100.

Kangle, R.P., Manu and Kautilya, *Indian Antiquary*, 3rd edition, I, 1964, pp. 42-54.

Kohli, Ritu, Kautilya's Political Thought, *SAR Economist*, November 1993, pp. 29-33.

Law, N.N., Machinery of Administration Depicted in the Kautilya, *IHQ*, V, 1929, pp. 441-50 and 614-42 and *IHQ*, VI, 1930, pp. 31-33.

———, Studies in the Kautilya, *IHQ*, VIII, 1931, pp. 464-74.

Marshall, T.H., The Welfare State, *Archieves: European Journal of Sociology*, Paris, Vol. 2, February, 1961.

Mehta, Usha and Srinivasan, R., Political Thought in Ancient India in *ICSSR's Survey of Research in Political Science*, New Delhi, ICSSR, 1966.

Mehta, U.H., Political Aspects of Dharma, Paper read at *Indian Political Seciene Conference*, 1970.

Mukherji, P., Property Rights of Women as recorded in Kautilya Arthasastra and Manusmriti, *Our Heritage*, IX, 1, Calcutta, 1961, pp. 49-60.

Nagar, Vandana, Saptang Theory of the Structure of the State, *School of Correspondence Courses and Continuing Education*, University of Delhi, Delhi, pp. 45-55.

Nagel, Stuart, S., The Need for Improved Policy Analysis in Developing Societies, *International Political Science Association Workshop* on April 13, 1993.

Narahari, H.C., Society in Mauryan India, *New Indian Antiquary*, II, 1939-40, pp. 710-20.

Ostrom, Vincent, Great Experiments and the Welfare State—Basic Paradigmatic Challenges, *International Political Science Association Workshop* on April 13, 1993, pp. 1-20.

Parmar, Aradhana, Kautilya's Political Thought, *Mimeo*, 1992, pp.1-25.

Peacock, Alan, Paper, The Welfare Society, *Unservile State Papers*, No. 2, London, 1963.

Ray, J.C., Textile Industry in Ancient India, *JBORS*, III, 1917, pp. 180-245.

Robson, W.A., India as a Welfare State, *Political Quarterly*, London, Vol. 25, No. 1.

Sankhdher, M.M., Concept of the State in Ancient India, *School of Correspondence Courses & Continuing Education*, University of Delhi, 1990-91, pp. 25-32.

———, Crisis in Welfare State: Warning Signals for Developing Societies, *International Political Science Association Workshop* on April 13, 1993, pp.1-25.

———, Indian Political Tradition, *The Hindustan Times*, March 13, 1982.

Sankhdher, M.M., The Misunderstood Manu, *Indian Express*, Monday, 9th May, 1994.

——— , Kautilya — Philosopher of Modern Welfare State, *Organiser*, Vol. 37, January 26, 1987, p. 21.

——— , Kautilya and Machiavelli — A Comparative Analysis, *School of Correspondence Courses & Continuing Education*, University of Delhi, Delhi, 1990-91, pp. 108-15.

——— , "Laissez-faire Foundations of the Welfare State", *Indian Political Science Review*, Delhi.

Sarkar, B.K., Kautilya : Economic Planning and Climatology, *IHQ*, XI, 1935, pp. 328-50.

———, Salaries and Allowances in the Arthasastra of Kautilya, *JOR*, XXVIII, 1958-59, pp. 11-16.

———, Hindu Political Philosophy, *PSQ*, 34, 1918, pp. 482-500.

Sarkar, Nilanjan, Political Thought in Arthasastra, term paper submitted to the Department of History, University's of Delhi, Delhi, 1983.

Sastri, K.A., Nilkanta, The Authority of the King in Kautilya's Political Thought, *IHQ*, XXIX, 1963, pp. 175-79.

Sharma, L.K., No Room for the Wretched — The Welfare State is in Peril, *The Sunday Times of India*, January 9, 1994.

Sihag, Balbir S., Kautilya's Vision, *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi.

Upadhyaya, Nirmala, The Welfare State in Ancient India, *JIH*, No. 50, 1971-72, pp. 133-47.

Journals and Newspapers

1. The Hindustan Times
2. Times of India
3. Indian Express
4. Jansatta (Hindi)
5. Nav Bharat Times (Hindi)

6. Indian Journal of Political Science
7. Indian Journal of Public Administration
8. Indian Journal of History
9. Organizer
10. Panchjanya
11. Manthan
12. Economic and Political Weekly
13. SAR Economist
14. India Today
15. Seminar
16. Frontline
17. The Week
18. The News

INDEX

The Author

Ritu Kohli is at present Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi, Delhi.

Miss Kohli has also to her credit another book *Political Ideas of M.S. Golwalkar*. Her area of interest is Indian Political Thought and she intends to remove the dichotomy of 'ancient' and 'modern' to discover a hidden unity and continuity in the thought system.

ISBN 81-7100-802-X